

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY  
COLLEGEVILLE, - MINNESOTA

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

EDITOR:

THE RIGHT REV. MGR CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., PH.D.

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

THE REV. CHARLES DAVIS, S.T.L.

---

Volume XLII

(NEW SERIES)

January—December 1957

---

LONDON

*THE CLERGY REVIEW*

128 SLOANE STREET,  
LONDON, S W.1.



To the Most Reverend

**WILLIAM GODFREY**

on the occasion of  
his appointment as

**Archbishop of Westminster**

**THE CLERGY REVIEW**

offers homage and respectful greeting

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES      VOL. XLII      NO. I      JANUARY 1957

## THE POPE AND PRIVATE<sup>1</sup> MASSES

IN some parts of central Europe there has been a tendency in recent years to disparage the multiplication of private Masses. Here in England we still take it for granted that a priest not needed for a public Mass will make arrangements for his private one. Indeed it is still the custom in most parts of the world for priests that are travelling or visiting congresses, whether or not they have any stipendiary obligation, to make arrangements to say each his own Mass. Already before *Mediator Dei*, liturgists were found who queried this practice. It was recognized that the custom came from an appreciation of one's priestly powers. But, suggested the liturgists, it is based on a wrong view of the liturgy. The Pope had these liturgists in mind when he wrote: "There are some who entirely disapprove of Masses that are offered privately and without a congregation, as though these were a departure from the original form of sacrifice. Some even say that priests cannot say Mass at several altars at the same time, because this is to split up the community and jeopardize its unity."<sup>2</sup>

It was doubtless chiefly at liturgical congresses and other gatherings of the clergy that large numbers of private Masses were felt to be an anomaly. In France at least the bishops took action and expressed their disapproval of making a habit of omitting private Masses on such occasions, with the result that the tendency away from them has in that country been checked. In other countries of the continent, in spite of the Pope's words, the movement has grown in strength and sympathy. The priests who favour attending a common Mass to saying a number of private Masses do not feel they are in contradiction with *Mediator Dei*, for they regard that as a statement of doctrine, whereas they are only concerned with practice. Moreover, they do not doctrinally disapprove of such

<sup>1</sup> 'Private' Mass is taken here to mean Mass with a server but no congregation.

<sup>2</sup> C.T.S. translation, 100.

Masses; they merely think the practice unnecessary and sometimes actually less fruitful. To give an example of their attitude: a priest I met during the summer, from a parish worked by eight priests, has just built a large church with only one altar, making it virtually impossible for more than half his priests to say Mass on a normal weekday.

The matter is of great interest since Pius XII's address to the recent Assisi Congress. He spoke then of the importance of every Mass, whether celebrated privately or publicly, and the superior value of any celebration to a mere assistance. But before going into details it will be helpful to survey the chief contributory factors to the movement. Two lines of thought have long been converging. The first was mainly historical and liturgical, and concerns types of concelebration, with an underlying suspicion of disapproval for the multiplication of private Masses. The second was primarily theological, and concerns the relative fruitfulness of one Mass and many Masses. The Pope shows in his address that he has both these movements in mind and wishes to apply a timely corrective.

The first line of thought is suggested by the Pope's mention of a distinction between *sacramental* and *ceremonial* concelebration. Some liturgists commonly refer to a community Mass attended by a group of communicating priests as a *ceremonial concelebration*. The distinction goes back to the year 1927 when it was first used by Hanssens to express two historical stages that he had detected in the history of the Mass. Solemn Mass in the early Church, assisted by priests, deacons and other ministers, was sometimes referred to by the Greek word *sulleitourgein* or concelebration. In this usage, not only assisting priests, but also deacons and others taking part in the ceremony were said to concelebrate. On the other hand, there is during that early period no evidence of a concelebration of the kind we practise today at an ordination, in which all the concelebrating priests pronounce the words of consecration together with the celebrating bishop. To distinguish these usages, Hanssens called the first type *ceremonial* and the second *sacramental* concelebration. He implied no theological judgement in his terminology, leaving to others to decide how far ceremonial concelebration might mean concelebration in any real theological sense. As

far as sacramental concelebration in his sense is concerned, the Church universally regards it as a full sacramental consecration on the part of each and all the concelebrating priests. In this case each priest has said Mass as truly as if he had celebrated alone.<sup>1</sup>

What Hanssens did make clear was that such sacramental concelebration was not primitive. We know that it existed at the time of the *Ordo Romanus Primus*, which is dated about the seventh century. Presumably it existed before this, but the state of the evidence shows that it must be dated after the first three centuries. In the Eastern Church, its introduction is more than ten centuries later, for it does not appear to be known until the eighteenth century, when it was taken over by Eastern Catholics under Roman influence, and later spread to the Orthodox Church.

In 1953 several attempts were made to interpret these historical facts. Some people thought that the early ceremonial concelebration could hardly have been looked upon as purely ceremonial, otherwise the sacramental concelebration could never have developed.

The Abbé Rogues, in 1953,<sup>2</sup> prepared the way for other interpretations by suggesting that it would be better to call the early type *concélebration large*, concelebration in a wide sense, as opposed to the later *strict concelebration*, as in an ordination Mass. He thought that we still possess in our liturgy some survivals of the less strict concelebration on three occasions: on Maundy Thursday, where private Mass is forbidden and priests encouraged to communicate at a common Mass; at diocesan synods; and at the blessing of an abbot. He suggested that on such occasions, though a priest might not be a co-minister of the Mass, he might perhaps be a priestly offerer. Has not a priest two functions at Mass, the *ministerial* and the *sacrificial* function? By virtue of the first, he confects the sacrament as the instrument of Christ. By virtue of the second, it was suggested, he offers in the name of the Church and on behalf of the Church. Must these two functions be considered inseparable?

In the same year Dom B. Botte gave a more careful theo-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *L'Ami du Clergé*, 27 September 1956, p. 583.

<sup>2</sup> *Paroisse et Liturgie*, 5 September 1953.

logical interpretation of the historical evidence for the early centuries.<sup>1</sup> He claimed that there was evidence to suggest that at no time had concelebration been purely ceremonial. He admitted that in the first three centuries there was no common recitation of the words of consecration by the concelebrating priests, but he thought that nevertheless the latter were regarded as truly sharing in the sacramental consecration. Since he was writing as a liturgical historian, he did not commit himself to the view that any communicating assistance at Mass, even at the present day, on the part of priests, was a sacramental concelebration with the celebrant. On the contrary, he said that whatever might have been true for the early centuries, such concelebration was no longer recognized by the Church and would no longer be valid until such time as the Church might revert to the earlier practice.

His interpretation of the facts relied considerably on one or two early descriptions of Mass, where the priests assisting seem to have a more intimate part in the action of the celebrating bishop than do any of the other assistants. Thus, in the *Apostolic Tradition* of St Hippolytus the assisting priests are said to lay their hands on the offertory gift, whereas the rest of the congregation merely showed their approval by acclamation. He likened this gesture of the priests to the laying-on of hands by the co-consecrating bishops at an episcopal consecration. He assumed that they thereby indicated their union with the consecrating bishop's words.<sup>2</sup>

Dom Botte also argued from an ambiguous passage in the *Didaskalia*, which says that a visiting bishop is to be invited to "speak over the cup"; and further from Eusebius's account of St Anicetus's "yielding the Eucharist to Polycarp". He found further evidence from the Mass described by St Cyril of Jerusalem, in which the hands of all the priests were to be washed by the deacons.

But he regarded probably as his strongest argument the unlikelihood that the full sacramental concelebration could have arisen without early precedent.

<sup>1</sup> *La Maison-Dieu*, 35 (1953), 9-23.

<sup>2</sup> The Holy Father in his address recalls his earlier decision that, as far as present usage is concerned, no one actually consecrates in an episcopal consecration except the bishop who pronounces the words.

These conclusions of Dom Botte, while not unimpressive, and supported by his own great authority as a liturgist and historian, yet were not the only theological interpretation of the early evidence. A year previously, an Orthodox writer, the Archpriest *N. Afanas'ev*,<sup>1</sup> had come to completely different conclusions on the basis of the same facts. He had in fact argued that in the early Church the Liturgy was looked upon as a concelebration by the whole congregation with only one sacramental celebrant. According to this view the concelebrating priests had no greater sacramental function than the concelebrating deacons together with other clergy and faithful.

Most of this was of course a matter of historical enquiry. But, in much of it, there was a strong implication that our modern sacramental concelebration was a late development not in the best ancient liturgical tradition, and that it might be a good example of liturgical restoration if the Church were to re-introduce the supposed earlier form of silent sacramental concelebration. In many people's minds there was added to these historical reasons what was thought to be a good pastoral one, namely that a silent sacramental concelebration might pastorally be preferable in certain circumstances to a multiplication of private Masses for those who desire to celebrate Mass and yet do not regard an extension of the present type of sacramental celebration with favour.

Meanwhile the same problem was being approached in Austria from a purely theological angle. In 1949, Dr Karl Rahner,<sup>2</sup> basing himself on the theology of the fruits of the Mass, argued that there was no sufficient theological basis for the common belief that where a hundred priests are gathered together it is better for them to say a hundred Masses than for all to take a communicating part in one.

At present priests are convinced that it is normally better each to say his own Mass, whether or not that Mass is public. Each Mass, they believe, has an efficacy of its own, gives God glory, and wins blessing for mankind.

It is well known that there are several theories concerning

<sup>1</sup> "Trapeza Gosponja", Paris, 1952. Quoted *Gregorianum*, vol. 36, 2 (1955), p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> *Zeitschrift für K. Theol.*, 71 (1949) 275 ff. It came out in book form in 1951 at Freiburg.

the efficacy of the Mass. As far as its intrinsic value is concerned, and the honour it gives to God, theologians are almost unanimous in agreeing that it is infinite. It can neither be more nor less than that of the Cross, since the two are substantially identical. De la Taille alone differed from this majority view in asserting that it is the Church not Christ that offers the Mass. For him then the Mass is infinite from the point of view of its victim, finite with regard to its offerer.

More important are the differences of opinion that arise in the attempt to explain the limitation of its efficacy when applied to human needs. That it is so limited is supposed by the belief and practice of the Church in offering many Masses for one purpose.

One line of explanation is normally rejected as evidently false. According to this view God determines arbitrarily that only a certain limited amount of the fruits won on Calvary will be applied through any one Mass.

The alternative to this view is to find the reason for limitation, not in an arbitrary decision on God's part but in man's lack of proper dispositions. This human lack may be either in the human offerers or in the human beneficiaries, or in both.

De la Taille finds the sole measure of these limits in the degree of devotion of the human offerers. In his theory it is the Church that offers Mass now, just as it was Christ that offered the sacrifice of the Last Supper and Calvary. The Church comprises priest, offerer of stipend, and congregation. The devotion of the following will then contribute: (i) the celebrant; (ii) the person who offers a stipend; (iii) the servers and congregation, according to the extent of their participation in the offering. Another factor will be the number of titles on which any one person offers. On the other hand, since there will be less devotion towards each beneficiary when Mass is offered for a large number, on these occasions each beneficiary will profit less than if the Mass had been offered for him alone. Yet another factor will be the numbers of those attending the Mass with devotion.

A rival view to that of de la Taille is Billot's. He measures the fruitfulness of a Mass on two factors: (a) the disposition of the person on whose behalf it is offered; and (b) the manner

in which the Mass is applied to him through the intention of the celebrant. The second factor means that Mass offered for one alone is more perfectly applied to that one than if it had been offered for many. This, said Billot, is because human acts have a limited capacity of distinct application to a number of objects.

De la Taille then judges from the offerers, Billot from both offerers and beneficiaries. It remains that Dr Doronzo measures the efficacy of the Mass solely from the dispositions of those on whose behalf Mass is offered.

Fr K. Rahner, basing himself, it seems, mainly upon the principles of de la Taille, argued that it is bad theology to think it necessarily better to say a private Mass than to take communicating part in some other priest's Mass. It is said that many Masses gives more glory to God than one. Fr Rahner, still in terms of de la Taille, argued that Christ's offering was completed on Calvary, now He offers Himself no more. At Mass then we have only the offering of the Church. Hence any external glory that is added to God through the Mass comes from the action of the Church. Now there is an action of the Church in every Mass; and so glory is given to God in every Mass. But the glory, like the efficacy, in each case must be measured by the degree to which the human offerers make Christ's sacrifice their own. The more the priest and congregation surrender themselves to the inner reality of the Mass, the more glory they will give. Likewise a priest himself gives more glory to God if he is more united to the sacrifice, completely regardless of whether he is celebrant or merely an attendant. His decision as between celebrating and attending Mass should therefore be based entirely on the devotion with which he partakes in either case. Further, there is more liturgical participation in the Mass where there is a greater sense of community among the offerers; hence it will often be more fruitful for a hundred priests to attend the Mass of one than for all to say Mass separately.

What about the efficacy? Is it not the common conviction of the faithful that *ex opere operato* a hundred Masses are more efficacious than one? Fr Rahner answered that the *ex opere operato* efficacy of any Mass is likewise limited only by the dis-

positions of the offerers. And he illustrates this by Trent's doctrine that the sacraments are limited in their effects only by the will of the Holy Spirit and personal co-operation of the recipients. Hence, Fr Rahner concluded, if the personal dispositions of the offerers are better when a hundred priests attend one Mass there will be more fruits from that one than if they celebrate separately with lesser personal devotion.

What about the very special personal fruit gained by the celebrant of the Mass? Fr Rahner answered that the existence of such personal fruit was only a theory which he regarded as indefensible.

Fr Rahner's views were startling and encouraged the liturgists who wanted to return to an earlier practice of fewer private Masses. However, many theologians felt they were tantamount to a *reductio ad absurdum* of the de la Taille theory. Oskar Graber of Graz<sup>1</sup> was satisfied to point out that Fr Rahner's views did not seem to harmonize with *Mediator Dei*. Pius XII had there been very insistent upon the distinction between the rôles of celebrating priest and laity at Mass. He had insisted that Christ the Head is the real offerer at every Mass, the celebrating priest being his minister. The priest is then the representative, not of the Church or congregation, but of Christ. Further, every private Mass has an objective and social character with effects independent of the devotion of the offerers. Oskar Graber also suggested that Fr Rahner had not sufficiently shown how his position differed from that condemned at Pistoia.<sup>2</sup>

The present writer may be perhaps pardoned for quoting from an article written by him earlier this year in relation to the same question: "It must be answered with St Thomas (3-82-12) that 'a grace given for God's honour and glory must not be despised'. He argues from this that it is good for a priest to say a private Mass even when there is no congregation to be present at it. He argues from II Cor. vi, 1, '*hortamur vos ne in vacuum gratiam Dei recipiatis*', and defends his conclusion that a priest should find opportunity to say Mass 'not only because of the faithful who need his ministration, but principally because of God to whom sacrifice is offered in the consecration of this

<sup>1</sup> *Neue Normen für die Häufigkeit der Messfeier*, Akad. Druck, Graz, 1953.

<sup>2</sup> *Dz.*, 1530, 1531.

sacrament'. He adds that the priest's obligation to offer this sacrifice comes from the very fact that he has received priestly orders." In the same article, a reference is made to St Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians (41): "Let each . . . in his own order . . . give thanks (Eucharist) unto God . . . not transgressing the appointed rule of his service." The priest's order is to offer sacrifice. "Let him, then, offer."<sup>1</sup> The article suggested that the modern increase of devotion to private Masses when public ones were not possible came from an increased sense of priestly dignity and function. "The multiplication of Masses does not increase the intrinsic value of the Cross, but it is necessary for the full and continual living worship of members of Christ living in human conditions between the Ascension and the Second Coming."

Still more recently, there has been a long article on the same subject in *L'Ami du Clergé*.<sup>2</sup> Mgr Michel there argued that Fr Rahner approximates the Mass too closely to the sacraments. In the sacraments we are merely receptive. It is natural that their efficacy will be affected by our personal receptiveness. In the Mass as a sacrifice we offer or give to God Christ's sacrifice, prayers and satisfaction, joined to those of the mystical body. The graces won by the Mass may have no immediate relation to the dispositions of those attending Mass. They may be, for instance, for someone's successful operation, for the grace of a good death, or for the souls in purgatory. In his further explanations, Mgr Michel thought that Fr Rahner was perhaps too dependent upon the theory of de la Taille. As his own preference, Mgr Michel puts forward the view of Billot, according to which Mass is measured partly in relation to the dispositions of the recipient, and partly by the more or less perfect way in which the application to the recipient is made by the offerers. The celebrant and the giver of a stipend both have their part in applying the Mass to the beneficiary; and the parts of both are different from that of the attending laity. We must beware of reducing the *ex opere operato* objective value of the Mass merely to the purely personal devotion of the offerers, regardless of their manner of offering.

<sup>1</sup> These passages from *Liturgy*, 107, July 1953. *Concelebration*. (H.F.D.)

<sup>2</sup> 1956, pp. 593-602.

With Fr Rahner's article and the various replies the matter was not yet closed. First of all, the Holy Father spoke to a group of bishops in November 1954,<sup>1</sup> when he insisted that in each Mass there was a special action of Christ, but that this sacrificial action was not multiplied merely by many priests attending Mass. Hence it was wrong to say that a hundred Masses could be equivalent to one. The Pope did however admit that as far as the purely personal fruit gained from piously hearing or saying Mass is concerned, it could happen that a priest would on a certain occasion do better by hearing Mass than by saying it. But as far as other fruits are concerned, notably those of satisfaction and impetration for the beneficiaries for whom Mass is offered, whether or not they are present, as well as the fruits for the faithful in general, living and dead, these are multiplied as the Mass is multiplied. "Quoad sacrificii Eucharistici oblationem tot sunt actiones Christi summi sacerdotis, quot sunt sacerdotes celebrantes, minime vero quot sunt sacerdotes Missam episcopi aut sacri presbyteri celebrantis pie audientes."<sup>2</sup>

Fr Rahner, writing in 1955,<sup>3</sup> argued that the Holy Father's words did not seriously affect his position. Those words did indeed reveal the possibility of being misled by the title of his original article, *The Many Masses and the One Sacrifice*. The "one sacrifice" referred not to the Mass, but to Calvary. He had not meant to say that many Masses were the same as one, but merely that one attended by many priests might in certain circumstances be as efficacious as many. He admitted that the Holy Father's words sounded like a contradiction of his statement that as far as Christ's action is concerned the Mass added nothing to Calvary. But he still thought that even if one admits a physically new action of Christ at every Mass, one must insist that there is no new physical act of Christ in heaven at each Mass adding any new glory to God. Finally, he still maintained the view that nothing but greater devotion on the part of the offerers could increase a Mass's fruitfulness. The Pope virtually admitted, Fr Rahner implied, that it could happen that it is

<sup>1</sup> A.A.S. (46), 1954, 666 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit., 669.

<sup>3</sup> *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theol.*, 77 (1955) 1, pp. 94 ff.: "Die vielen Messen als die vielen Opfer Christi."

better for a hundred priests to attend the mass of one than for all to say Mass privately with perhaps less care and devotion. Fr Rahner added what he had said before, that a man who offers a stipend for a hundred Masses would not benefit any more than if he had offered the same stipend for one, unless some secondary factor changes the circumstances. The reader will remember what Fr Rahner said about the "other fruits", mentioned by the Holy Father as being independent of the dispositions of those present. Though these appeared quite important in the Pope's wording (*fructus . . . placationis et impetrationis pro illis, pro quibus sacrificium offertur, etsi ipsi sacrificio non adsint; item fructus "pro fidelium vivorum peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus, sed et pro defunctis in Christo, nondum ad plenum purgatis"*), Fr Rahner argued that any fruits for people not present at Mass must be less than for those present and offering, and hence the total of efficacy would still be in proportion to the devotion of the offerers.

Later last year Fr Rahner wrote another article, in which he suggested that since so many priests seem to have scruples about following his theory, all the advantages of a common celebration, together with the full advantages of private celebration could be gained by what he calls *silent sacramental concelebration*. This brings us back in line with the starting point of our article. However, Fr Rahner has his own explanation. He distinguishes, as indeed Fr Rogues has done previously, between consecrating and offering. At a normal Mass these are both identified with the same action of consecrating. But, he argued, they are theologically distinct. The priest not only consecrates as the instrument of Christ, but he also makes the priestly act of offering sacrifice. Fr Rahner suggests that there would be true concelebration if one priest pronounced the words and the other priests joined, not in pronouncing the words, but in the act of offering the sacrifice. In this case, if the Church approved of it, only one priest would bring about transubstantiation; but all concelebrating would co-offer the Mass.

It is at this point that we have to understand the Holy Father's words at the recent liturgical Congress. He there gave his definitive judgement on this long controversy.

Once again, Pius XII insists that it is erroneous to hold that "the offering of one Mass at which a hundred priests assist with religious devotion is the same as a hundred Masses celebrated by a hundred priests". But he does not forbid the custom for a good reason, without prejudice to his earlier statement, of priests attending Mass rather than saying private Masses at a liturgical congress. He repeats that the actions of Christ, the High Priest, are as many as are the priests celebrating, but not as many as are priests reverently hearing Mass. He repeats that a priest hearing Mass is in the same position as an assisting layman.

Regarding the theology involved, he declares that Christ offers Himself at Mass at the moment of consecration, when the priest-celebrant takes on Christ's person. At this moment the whole action of Christ, the Lord's offering, is accomplished.

Against some of the recent views it seems he insists that no other "offering" of the victim, whether by priests or people, is an action of Christ. He adds that true sacramental concelebration, on the other hand, as at an ordination, where a number of priests have the intention of consecrating and actually pronounce with celebrating bishop or priest the words of consecration, is a true Action of Christ through each of the concelebrating priests.

The Pope further adds that where the "concelebrating" priests do not pronounce the words of consecration (This is My Body, This is My Blood) together with the celebrant, their concelebration is *purely ceremonial*, and could be done equally by a group of laymen. (There is then no such thing as a silent sacramental concelebration.) The same applies even if the "concelebrating" priests unite their wills with that of the chief celebrant and declare that they make their own *his* actions and words. "They must themselves perform the actions and pronounce the essential words."

The Holy Father has said nothing further about the fruits of the Mass. He takes no sides in the various theories. But it is clear that he favours the view that it is to God's glory and the benefit of mankind that a priest normally, when possible, says his Mass. The only other way of exercising our priestly powers and giving to God the particular honour and glory that comes

from the celebration of Mass, as well as of each being able to apply our Mass to human needs, is by true sacramental concelebration, which at present is allowed only at ordination. That these two ways of acting with full exercise of our priestly powers are equal is accepted by theologians. In answer to a question on this point, Mgr Michel wrote in *L'Ami du Clergé* recently: "It is certain that this Mass celebrated by seven priests has the same value as seven Masses that the priest could have celebrated individually. It is indeed in complete conformity with Christ's institution that the priests can consecrate together, forming one undivided presbyterium. The words of consecration pronounced by all the priests constitute one sacramental sign, one form of consecration, and each and all celebrate the eucharistic sacrifice."<sup>1</sup> This form of concelebration has been scrupulously defended by the Holy Father in his allocutions.

H. FRANCIS DAVIS

---

## A WORD FOR FÉNELON

### I

THERE are certain figures of the religious life whose appeal extends beyond the boundaries of their faith. The memory of culture preserves them in her mansion: they belong to the imagination of the world. Some of these figures the Church has canonized, while others exist as the object of individual veneration. To the first belongs St Francis of Assisi; to the second, Fénelon and Newman.

The broad ubiquitous appeal of these spiritual personalities draws on a fund of witnesses. Those who never knew them, as well as those who met them, testify alike to their grace and charm, their instinctive address to one's inmost being. Reading their words, we are reminded of Cardinal Newman's Latin motto: *Cor ad cor loquitur*. Heart speaks to heart—to the secret "still centre", that "silent very self" as de la Mare has termed it.

With Fénelon the tribute which belief or unbelief pays to

<sup>1</sup> 27 September 1956, p. 583.

the invisible image of the man is of a memorable nature. "If Fénelon were alive today you would be a Catholic," Bernadin de St Pierre once wagered Rousseau." "Oh, if Fénelon were alive," Rousseau replied, his eyes moist with tears, "I should try to become his lackey in order to deserve to be his valet." From the compulsive and emotional Rousseau to the reserved reflective Walter Pater is a long step, but one which the presence of Fénelon's spirit serenely traverses. The Fénelon who fascinated Pater was the Fénelon splendid in exile, humble in heart, but adorning his defeat with the airs of a kind of chastened distinction. The portrait which Pater paints of Fénelon is found in his study of Antony Watteau which he entitled *A Prince of Court Painters*. Watteau, fresh from his triumphs in Paris, is visiting his kinsfolk at Valenciennes. On the last day of his stay, the artist and Pater's imaginary diarist make a party to Cambrai. "We entered the cathedral church: it was the hour of Vespers, and it happened that *Monseigneur le Prince de Cambrai*, the author of *Télémaque*, was in his place in the choir. He appears to be of great age, assists but rarely at the offices of religion, and is never to be seen in Paris; and Antony had much desired to behold him. Certainly it was worth while to have come so far only to see him, and hear him give his pontifical blessing, in a voice feeble but of infinite sweetness, and with an inexpressibly graceful movement of the hands. A veritable *grand seigneur*! His refined old age, the impress of genius and honours, even his disappointments, concur with natural graces to make him seem too distinguished (a fitter word fails me) for this world. *Omnia vanitas*! he seems to say, yet with a profound resignation, which makes the things we are most of us so fondly occupied with look petty enough. *Omnia vanitas*! Is that indeed the proper comment on our lives, coming, as it does in this case, from one who might have made his own all that life has to bestow? Yet he was never to be seen at court, and has lived here almost as an exile. Was our 'Great King Lewis' jealous of a true *grand seigneur* or *grand monarque* by natural gift and the favour of heaven, that he could not endure his presence?"

Turning from Rousseau's excitability and Pater's refined eclecticism to the shrewd hard-headedness of Saint-Simon, we encounter further evidence, eloquent on Fénelon's behalf. The

sketch which the keen-witted memoir-writer draws is among his very best. "A tall, spare man of good figure, pale, with a prominent nose, eyes from which fire and intellectual power seemed to pour like a torrent, and a countenance the like of which I have never seen in any other man, and which, once seen, you could never forget. Everything was there in perfect combination, and the simultaneous presence of the most contradictory elements produced no effect of incongruity. In him were blended seriousness and gaiety, gravity and courtesy. He was at once the scholar, the prelate, and the *grand seigneur*. His outstanding characteristics, which seemed to impress themselves even on his material surroundings, were refinement, great intellectual gifts, wit, eloquence, decorum, and above all noblesse. . . . His manner was in perfect keeping with his appearance. His ease was infectious to all around him. His conversation was marked by that charm and good taste which only comes of long familiarity with the best society and the habits of the great. He possessed a natural gift of eloquence, graceful and finished, and a most insinuating yet noble and befitting courtesy; an easy, clear, agreeable mode of speech, a marvellous gift of lucid exposition. Add to all this, that he never tried to appear cleverer than those with whom he was conversing, but always put himself on a level with them, making them feel quite at their ease."

But it is when a man's enemies, or those who have carried arms against his cause, are to be found speaking in his favour—when even the ranks of Tuscany can scarce forbear to cheer—that we listen the most intently.

On Bossuet's death, his secretary the Abbé Le Dieu decided to visit the legendary one-time opponent of his master.<sup>1</sup> Provided with letters from Mme de Maisonfort—one of those numerous *grandes dames* who sought direction from Fénelon—he arrived at the Archbishop's Palace as the prelate was returning from a pastoral visitation. "As soon as I saw him entering," writes Le Dieu, "I respectfully drew near. Just at first I thought his manner a little cold, and fancied I detected the faintest shadow of annoyance, yet he was gentle withal, and perfectly

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, and Fénelon, Prince-Archbishop of Cambrai, contested fiercely over the writings of Mme Guyon, more fully touched on later in this essay.

polite. Kindly, but without effusion, he invited me to his room. 'I am availing myself, Monseigneur,' said I, 'of your Grace's suggestion that I should visit you when a suitable opportunity presented itself,' adding in a lower tone that I was the bearer of messages and a letter from Madame de Maisonfort. . . . The Archbishop was attired in long violet robes, cassock and chimere, with bright crimson buttons and button-holes. There were no gold tassels or gold fringe on his girdle, and round his hat was a plain green silk cord. He was wearing white gloves, and had neither stick nor cloak. I delivered the packet I had for him as soon as we entered, and without opening it he bade me sit down in an armchair similar to his own. He refused to let me take a more modest seat and insisted on my wearing my hat. . . . Dinner having already been announced, he rose and invited me to a seat at his table. All the company were awaiting him in the dining-room. No one had come to his room, it being known that I was closeted with him there. We all washed our hands, one after another, without any ceremony. The Archbishop said grace and, of course, took his place at the head of the table with the Abbé de Chanterac on his left. Then, the rest of the company, when they had washed, sat down wherever it pleased them. I chose an inconspicuous seat among the others, and a plate of soup was forthwith set before me; but the seat on the Archbishop's right being vacant, His Grace beckoned me to come and take it. I thanked him but said I was already seated and served. With great courtesy he insisted. 'Come,' he said, 'your place is here.' After that I obeyed his summons without further demur, and my soup was duly brought to me in my new seat. . . . The Archbishop was so good as to help me with his own hands to everything that was choicest on the table. Each time, as I thanked him, I raised my hat, and each time, he took off his hat to me. He further did me the honour to drink my health with a grave yet easy courtesy. The conversation was similarly easy and delightful, sometimes even merry. The Archbishop took his share in the general talk and allowed everyone to have his say. I noticed that his chaplains, his secretaries and his squire joined in the conversation as freely as the rest, though no one ventured on any chaff or personal repartee. . . . Indeed, I met with far more modesty and meek-

ness in master, nephews and everyone else than I had ever experienced elsewhere."

This is a living and likely enough picture to convince the least hagiographically minded, and all the more compelling upon our attention for that preliminary sentence: "Just at first I thought his manner a trifle cold, and fancied I detected the faintest shadow of annoyance." "I need," wrote Fénelon in a letter which elucidates these implications, "humiliation more than most men, by reason of my naturally proud character, and because God requires a more absolute death to all pride of me." Because of this pride, we prize all the more his "gentle" and "perfectly polite" self-restraint, ripening through "great courtesy" to its maturity in "modesty and meekness" never quite experienced elsewhere. "We need," says Fénelon to a correspondent, "very diligent faithfulness to God in the smallest things. . . . The smallest things become great when God requires them of us." The man who receives news of the Papal Brief against his treatise *Maxims of the Saints* while preparing to preach in his own cathedral and straightway changes the subject of his discourse to a sermon on submission, and the host who masters his own haughty temper at the appearance of a suspect guest, are of the same grain—grace runs through them both.

Fénelon's claims on our intellectual interests are manifold and considerable; but whether our attention be set on the romancier of *Telemachus*, the pedagogue of the *Treatise on the Education of Girls*, the humanist of *Dialogues on Eloquence* and *Letter to the Academy*, the theologian of *The Attributes of God*, or the redoubtable spiritual director of the *Letters to Men and Women*, it is because of this note of grace—his feeling for the God-given personality of those whom he addresses, together with an absence of all self-assertion—that we read him with pleasure and profit today. To take austerity and render it golden by withdrawing the harshness of egoism from it, to preserve from a contact with humane studies a dignity proper to the creature while rejecting the pride accompanying them—such, to take a large view, was Fénelon's achievement. And because of this, his words have access to minds that might otherwise have missed the letter of his wisdom. With or without the folds of faith, we hear his voice attuned to us: *cor ad cor loquitur*.

## II

François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon was born on 6 August 1651, in le Sarladais, Périgord, in south-west France. His family was noble but impoverished, and the boy being delicate and dreamy (the child of a late second marriage), the Church seemed a more natural calling than the profession of arms. There was also an uncle who was Bishop of Sarlat ready to assist his first steps thither. So, after study at the Collège du Plessis, he entered the seminary of Saint-Sulpice where he applied himself under M. Tronson, a director for whom he entertained a respectful life-long affection.

On taking orders, Fénelon received his initial charge in the parish of Saint-Sulpice, where the poor of the slums and the children in need of religious instruction were his special care. His labours were accomplished with a winning charm and patience, and rumours of his eloquence which reached the *haut monde* caused men and women of fashion to flock to his pulpit. But this young priest with a voice of gracious sweetness was restless in his narrow employ. Saint-Simon, who describes him as a "man of quality without a penny-piece to call his own", does not scruple to call him ambitious. "Fénelon," he wrote, before knowing him better, "had knocked, and knocked in vain, at every possible door." Fénelon was certainly determined to discover the full right use of his precocious talents. For a while, he acted as superior of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, a community founded in 1634 to instruct and confirm in the Catholic faith women newly converted from Protestantism. The necessity of learning to communicate his meaning to those who in part spoke a different spiritual language exercised him in that flexibility, that power to come home sympathically to the conscience of diverse men and women, which was part of his charm as a figure of note in the worldly Court of Louis XIV.

King Louis once characterized him as "*le plus bel esprit et le plus chimérique de mon royaume*". *Chimérique*—inclining to utopian schemes—Fénelon undoubtedly was in his younger undisillusioned days. Visiting his uncle at Sarlat, he wrote to Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, his friend and later his bitter opponent, con-

cerning a proposed visit to Greece and the Levant (then in Turkish hands) which he had hopes of undertaking: "The whole of Greece lies open before me. The Sultan shrinks back in terror. Already the Pelponesus is breathing the air of freedom, and the Church of Corinth is about to put forth new bloom. The voice of the Apostle shall again be heard in the land. I feel as though I had been wafted on wings to those noble scenes and priceless ruins, there to refresh my soul, not only with the sight of those wondrous buildings, but to bathe it in the very spirit of antiquity. I turn my steps towards the Areopagus where, to the sages of the world, St Paul proclaimed the advent of the Unknown God. But after the sacred comes the profane, and I do not forget to make my way down to the Piraeus, where Socrates is busily engaged planning the scheme of his ideal Republic. I scale the twin peaks of Parnassus and cull the laurels of Delphi, I revel in the delights of Tempe. When shall the blood of the Turks mingle with the blood of the Persians on the plains of Marathon, so that the whole of Greece may be given up to religion, philosophy, and the fine arts, which look upon her as their native home?"

The simple enthusiasm of these words is more poetic than practical (and, indeed, the intended missionary remained on native soil), but they are of interest for the light they shed on Fénelon's devotion to both a classical and Scriptural culture. In this love there was no conflict.<sup>1</sup> Fénelon knew and often proclaimed how barren are the airs of knowledge unredeemed by the graces of the spirit. But the humane arts of the antique world in the service of the Christian ideal—this was quite another matter, as Fénelon's writings so choicely demonstrate. The Muses which he yoked to his car are not the inspirers of hollow adornment. They are the vehicles of legitimate delight, the gently persuasive instruments of virtue.

In 1681 Fénelon became Prior of Carennac, the priory being a sort of fief or traditional family possession. Ironically, yet still with a current of excitement, he describes in a letter to a relation the fêtes and ceremonies in honour of his assuming this office.

<sup>1</sup> Sainte-Beuve writes of Fénelon as possessing "the spirit of piety", and "the spirit of antiquity", and considers *Telemachus* "the unique monument of that happy and almost impossible harmony".

Playfully, the ambitious spirit shows through his pleasure and amusement. "Aye, Madame," he tells her, "have no doubt about it; I am a man destined to come on the scene with pomp and circumstance."

Bossuet—"the spokesman of the bourgeois conscience", as J. Lewis May calls that worthy but insensitive and unperceptive Bishop—now set him a polemical task of some delicacy and importance: a critique and refutation of Père Malebranche's "pantheistical" treatise on *Nature and Grace*. Malebranche, with necessitarian logic, had imprisoned God within his own immutable laws. Fénelon's reply, which rehabilitated the mystical freedom of Deity, was considered an eminently successful answer; a blow struck for orthodoxy. Strange that the occasion on which Fénelon won his theological spurs should have been of Bossuet's making!

Fénelon had already been offered advancement at the hands of De Harley, the corrupt Archbishop of Paris. These overtures he had calmly rejected. Now they were to come from higher sources. Fénelon's gifts as an educationalist had been proved by his work as a catechist at Saint-Sulpice and as the author of a *Treatise on the Education of Girls* written to guide Mme de Beauvilliers, the mother of a numerous family, a duchess, and a woman of style. On 17 August 1689, Fénelon was appointed tutor to the Duc de Bourgogne, son of the Grand Dauphin, and an heir to the throne of France. His position in the royal household, combined with his reputation as a melting preacher and a cleric of wit, set him as a star in Louis' brilliant court. Soon he was attracting to himself an élite of earnest yet fashionable persons, eager to profit from the young Abbé's counsels and to catch, if possible, something of that touch of sweet decorum and comely virtue which so well became its exponent. Even Mme de Maintenon—that adventuress turned royal *dévôte*—looked encouragingly upon him. His ducal charge—a boy of stormy temper—was won by Fénelon's patient firmness. The King was ageing, his son dissolute; his grandson might some day inherit the crown; and behind him, as a counsellor of better laws, might stand Fénelon who as yet had not reached his fortieth year.

In 1695, with the Bishops of Châlons and Amiens assisting,

Fénelon was consecrated Prince-Archbishop of Cambrai, the chief consecrator being Bossuet. But this is to hurry forward with success. Already there had entered on the scene the simple unwitting cause of his downfall—Mme Guyon, the enthusiast. Along with her book of private devotion—the *Moyen Court*, or *Short Way* to perfection—Mme Guyon became established as an influence at court. Her principal sponsors were Fénelon and Mme de Maintenon herself. Swiftly her teachings penetrated the walls of Saint-Cyr, a convent under the patronage of Mme de Maintenon. "The whole house," it is said, "almost became Quietist without knowing it. No one talked of anything save of the pure love of God, of self-abandonment, of holy indifference, of simplicity. This last-named virtue served as a veil for all their little self-indulgences. They treated themselves to their little comforts with the holy liberty of the children of God. No one worried about anything, not even about their salvation."

This concentration of the loving spirit on God without proportionate regard for sacraments, good works, and perseverance was thought to be highly dangerous; and the Bishop of Chartres, the ecclesiastical superior of Saint-Cyr, intervened. "In a trice," as Mr Lewis May puts it, "Mme Guyon and Fénelon were dropped." Nor were matters left at that. Previously, the *Moyen Court* or *Short Way* to perfection had received protective theological approval; but now steps were taken to re-investigate the strange promulgations of its ecstatic author. All might have died down discreetly enough had not Fénelon been touched by the persecution of this woman who, whatever the unwisdom of her words, was quite without heretical intent or the steadfast passion of disobedience. Her plight appealed to the aristocrat in him, to the chivalry inherited from his stock. But, also, there existed on his part a critical but profound sympathy for certain aspects of her teaching. In her relaxing of the striving will to wait upon and rest in the will of God, in her notion of holy trust, and her happy absence of scruples, he found for himself and kindred spirits a corrective to formally accented endeavour. Well might Fénelon have cited Dante's great line as a summary of all he found in Mme Guyon's thought—"that simple, but perfect, single line", as Matthew Arnold rightly calls it: "*in la sua volontade è nostra pace*"—"in his will is our peace". Politely but

firmly, the steely mind of Fénelon drew to her defence. Bossuet, the majestic "apotheosis of the ordinary",<sup>1</sup> took up the polemical cudgel on the side of conservative religion. The battle was on, friends were separated, and not until Rome most reluctantly spoke was the drama of division in France terminated.

Here, we can extensively examine neither the human nor theological implications of the affair. Abbé Bremond and, more recently, Count de la Bedoyere have entered their respective briefs for Fénelon in two thoughtful books,<sup>2</sup> while Mgr Knox has devoted an objective chapter to the contest in his informative work *Enthusiasm*. On the level of personalities, both Abbé Bremond and Count de la Bedoyere are of the opinion that the villain of the piece, the motivating source of dissension, is discoverable in Mme de Maintenon. They believe her to have been taken with Fénelon's winning ways and virtues, to have resented the respect he showed for the more mystical Mme de Gayon, and out of a spiritual possessiveness to have attempted to wean him from her. When this failed, they argue that Mme de Maintenon did not hesitate to make Bossuet her instrument of intrigue. Long before Rome pronounced her verdict on Fénelon's *Maxims of the Saints*, his career in the Gallican Church was ended. Dismissed as preceptor from the royal household, he was banished to his diocese of Cambrai; in the eyes of the worldly and self-interested a disgraced and self-ruined man.

Essentially, the dispute between Fénelon and Bossuet centred round the former's proposition that man *may* love God for Himself alone, outside of any reference or thought to his salvation. This, Bossuet staunchly denied; the fact that Fénelon's statement was framed only to cover the procedure of a few—those souls with certain interior gifts—counting for nothing with this "grand simplificateur".<sup>3</sup> Of these two embattled positions, the Pope is said to have remarked, "Cambrai errs through excess of divine love: Meaux, through deficiency of love for one's neighbour." Here, we need only note the relevance of Fénelon's contention to the spiritual advice contained in his *Letters to Men and Women*. Acceptance of God's will in the death of self-love is the

<sup>1</sup> *Fénelon*, by J. Lewis May.

<sup>2</sup> *Apologie pour Fénelon*, par Bremond. *The Archbishop and The Lady*, by Michael de la Bedoyere.

<sup>3</sup> *Apologie pour Fénelon*, by Abbé Bremond.

keystone of all his counsel. But that he would not have us rest in this isolated unity with God, without the slow grind of moral effort, the medicine of the confessional, and the strengthening food of Communion, is shown in letter after letter.

The dice, however, were loaded against him. Rome, under pressure from the Gallican Church, misinformed by Bossuet's agents, and anxious not to offend King Louis, gave judgement against Fénelon. His *Maxims of the Saints* "was condemned in general, not on the ground that it betrays the reader into wrong conclusions but that it *might* do so by gradual degrees".<sup>1</sup> This verdict for Bossuet's party was by way of a disappointment. "The prosecution," Monsignor Knox tells us, "had asked for a bull, and they were given a brief—less formal, less weighty, less worthy (they felt) of the occasion." Light as Rome's censure proved, it was sufficient to confirm Fénelon in the ruin of his bright expectations. Louis XIV never relented, the Dauphin on whom he had set his hopes died before ascending the throne. "The swan of Cambrai," as he was called, ended his days in exile, even as his cherished poet Virgil closed his eyes in banishment from Rome to the Black Sea. Nor was his sentence a personal loss alone. Fénelon's defeat struck a long-lasting blow to the reformation party in Church and State. "Show the world," he wrote in one letter, "a courtier who lives a life of simple faith"; and while at court he had sought to fashion a man-of-the-world who was yet a man-of-God. Such a group he at length assembled. Personages of power, its high-born members looked to Fénelon as a counsellor in common. His removal from the precincts of *le roi soleil* left them without a rallying mind, their hands tied by the suspicion of the King.

But in the school of calamity to which Fénelon was now come, his gifts, and graces, and insights were not wasted. His faculties denied that wide front of application to which the court had accustomed them, now turned the more continuously inward to explore the spirit of man in its depth. And what he encountered there was a strange new diocese, the dark side of the human moon in which legions of shadowy urges, under the sable banner of self-love, strove to deceive and destroy the peaceful soul and objective conscience. Not that Fénelon's

<sup>1</sup> *Enthusiasm*, by R. A. Knox.

Cambrai counsels are a teaching of lamentation. What he found when he looked within himself was what the Christian must be prepared to find. Ambition and pride, balked of outward prey, had gone underground to perform their sapper's work. In learning to deal with these insidious forces, Fénelon increased his wisdom, his patient skill as a spiritual director, his confidence in God's providence and power. Many of his letters were written from Cambrai to men and women who sought his assistance on some particular failing or distress. Along with such correspondents as the Comtesse de Montbérón, the Duc and Duchesse de Chevreuse, the Vidame d'Amiens, the old and young Duchesse de Montemort, we can be grateful for his answers.

Fénelon's deepening spirituality, attendant upon his exile, did not go unaccompanied by those humane studies which he ever prized. Elected to a seat in the French Academy, prior to his dismissal from Paris, he now set himself to outline some suggestions on the work and function of such an august body. His *Letter to the Academy* is one of the classics of his language: lucid, calm, and liberal alike in thought and composition. Nor were more sustained theological studies left unattended to. In Cambrai, he wrote the second part of his *Treatise on the Attributes of God*, his *Manual of Piety*, and various critiques of Jansenist thinking.

On 1 January 1715, the Feast of the Circumcision, Fénelon fell seriously ill. A week later, on 7 January, he died at a quarter past five in the morning. He was buried without any funeral panegyric lest tokens of respect might incense the King; but report has it that Pope Clement wept, sorrowing at the loss of such a spirit and regretful that from "motives of political prudence, he had never made a Cardinal of one whom, in his heart, he had so desired to honour".<sup>1</sup>

DEREK STANFORD

(To be concluded)

*Fénelon*, by J. Lewis May.

## THE MEANING OF OWNERSHIP

OWNERSHIP and the qualities that flow from it are necessary for the development of man's free personality. This is easier to appreciate in a more simple form of society than in the one we have today where methods of production are immensely complicated, and where mass production techniques leave little scope for the individual. A man who tills the earth which he owns, or who uses his own tools to exercise a craft of which he is proud, has a certain stability and security in the job itself, and finds in it a creative control which his intelligent nature needs. In such a society personal ownership is the obvious way of doing things, as it is the way in which each man can find the maximum of satisfaction. But what is one to say when a whole group of men, any number from a handful to thousands, must combine together to manufacture certain goods? It is altogether too facile a solution to the problem of ownership in these circumstances to say that once production becomes complicated personal ownership must be dropped and public ownership put in its place.

Not all ownership is concerned with material things, with land or money, machines or shares. There is a sense in which we own and enjoy non-material things. But this kind of ownership raises no problems. A symphony or a poem or a friendship may be enjoyed by any number of people without being used up. Any factor that limits this type of ownership cannot come from the thing owned; it must come either from the selfishness of the original owner or from a man's inability to appreciate it to the full. This is obviously not the case with material goods, for they are always limited in number. In fact, at present there are not enough houses, enough clothes, enough food to provide the peoples of the world with the minimum of human comfort and dignity that is their right. Moreover, human demand is always indefinite and varied. Needs grow more quickly than wealth, and suffer unaccountable changes. Even if the tempo of industrial production could be speeded up, say by the widespread adoption of automation, to such an extent that everybody's primary needs were satisfied, there would still be a

problem of ownership. Men desire things not only for their usefulness but for their rarity. In other words, even if there were enough goods to go round, there would always be some people who would want this thing rather than that. Even if the desire for undifferentiated foodstuffs, for example, were satisfied, the desire for differentiated goods, such as a particular brand of cereal or jam, would become even stronger.

We are living in an economy of scarcity where not even the basic needs of everybody in the world are yet satisfied, and are far from the position where everyone can own all he wants. But everyone has a right to a minimum amount of ownership. He has the right to be an owner, or at least to be in the position where he enjoys the benefits which flow from ownership. It follows then that for society to flourish the goods of the earth should be so organized that everyone enjoys the benefits of ownership. In this way the general good is assured.

It seems clear that the small family unit, whether in business or in agriculture, is almost a thing of the past. We live in an age of large-scale manufacturing where it is impossible to distribute the means of production among those who work with them. One machine for a particular process may cost thousands of pounds and be operated by a number of workers. This makes it difficult to see how any individual worker in this situation could exercise the essential functions of ownership, namely control over his work and the disposition of the fruits of his work. But the great technical strides that have been made in industry have been accompanied by great strides in the workers' "coming of age". This century, of industrial production, differs from all previous centuries in that there is now universal education, there are powerful workers' organizations, and the worker himself is now better able to assume his responsibilities and adjust himself to his place in the enterprise. The question to be answered is: Who shall own what in modern industry?

As a preliminary to answering this, we must think further about the connexion between ownership and the owner, the human person who has this right. We are concerned with ownership of the means of production rather than with the ownership of wealth, although the same principles apply to both forms of ownership.

Man is both an individual and a social being, for while he has his own personal value and dignity, many of his qualities can be fully developed only through association with others, that is in society. Co-operation is part of man's being. His rights and dignity flow from his very nature as man; so does his duty to collaborate with others. He should further the common good by fair dealing and neighbourliness. Many of our rights are conditioned by the fact that we must live in society, in fellowship with others. We cannot do what we like even with those things which are legitimately our own. A man with a gun can fire it with much more freedom in the open country than he can do in the town; a man can drive a car much faster along a main highway than he can through the congested streets of a city. The use of what we own is always conditioned by our circumstances and surroundings.

The social restrictions that flow from the common good do not lessen the essential freedoms to which men have a right, because the limits come from the necessity of order. The result, the harmony produced by the free acceptance of order, is something far greater than anything that could have been produced by a system of every man for himself.

Order, freely accepted, promotes harmony and peace. Most people would agree with this in theory, but would qualify their agreement by saying "Yes, but what order do you mean where property is concerned? Who is going to say what the order should be?" A nineteenth-century capitalist would have said that it was the already established order, where a few people (comparatively speaking) owned the means of production and the rest of mankind was hired by them. A twentieth-century Marxist would say that the State (in the name of the people) should own everything, and that it (in practice the particular group in power) should impose social order. Both these answers are unsatisfactory from the point of view of freedom for the greatest number of people, because in effect the few are ruling the many. In the good society order is never imposed for its own sake, but only so that the greatest number of men may enjoy the greatest possible freedom to develop their personality according to the nature and norms of a spiritual being. This should mean a balance of freedoms which is dictated by the

situation, whether political or economic. Thus the form of economic production would determine the form that ownership would take, differing from age to age and from system to system, but always trying to provide the maximum possibility for all men to enjoy the functions of ownership. The situation itself should provide social goals for everyone. The free acceptance of these social goals assist man to achieve perfection, while a narrow concern with personal goals not only excludes the good of society but leaves man himself in many respects unfulfilled.

In the modern world we cannot help being dependent on one another. This is true in methods of production, it is true in our system of economic distribution, it is true in the whole pattern of our living. Obviously the more dependency, the greater the danger of one man or a group of men being able to exercise too much power over the other members of the community. Hence any activity of man that touches the community should be subject to social control. In particular, ownership should not even be thought of apart from the social obligations that go with it. Once a man owns, then others have the right to qualify his activities. The more his wealth, property and power expands—through the work of others whom he directs and pays—the more he should be submitted to social control, by sharing the fruits of this ownership, namely the disposition and control of his wealth, with all whom it affects.

Up to now we have spoken of "the owner" as though he were a single individual, but this does not correspond with economic nor with legal fact. Most people would say that the legal owners of big firms are the shareholders, who may vary from a few members of a family owning a family business to many thousands in a large concern. (General Electric of America has 358,000 shareholders of whom nearly 4000 attended this year's Annual Meeting—in the company's publicity they refer to this as "People's Capitalism"! ) It is obvious that these thousands, hundreds of thousands, are *not* enjoying ownership in the true and full sense of the term as we have used it up to now. They do not control, direct or administer. A small minority (perhaps one per cent) may attend an annual general meeting, but for the most part they are content to clip their coupons and collect their dividends, leaving the general direction to a board

of directors (who, so long as all goes well, are regularly voted back on the board as a matter of course) and the day-to-day supervision to the general manager. Of course many small firms still do exist, in fact in England they still form the majority. They are either family businesses where members of the family occupy managerial positions, or they are owned and controlled by one man. In all these cases legal ownership and management are in the same hands. What we shall have to say about the wider aspects of ownership applies equally to such firms as well as to the larger plants controlled by public companies. The real power, in whatever form of enterprise where men are employed, the real sense of ownership if you will, is enjoyed by those who administer the business, the directors and management. This power, in many cases, is also shared in to some extent by the Trade Union representatives in the factory. Their share may not be great, but they have *some* say in some of the decisions that are made.

When we look at modern industry in this fashion we see that where the shareholder exists, although he seems to be the legal owner, he has in effect least of all to do with the actual aspects of ownership and nothing at all if his shares are non-voting. He is passive and is no more than a sleeping partner and, as such, after allowing that he should be paid a just dividend, he may be omitted from a discussion about real active ownership.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the most striking proof of this in the modern world is the phenomenally successful Volkswagen firm in Western Germany which in theory still belongs to the now defunct Nazi Labour Front but in effect has no legal owner. This does not imply either approbation or otherwise of its benevolent dictator, Herr Nordhoff, but merely illustrates the fact that an enormous enterprise can function, and successfully, without any shareholding owners. The people who really count are management, technicians, skilled and unskilled workers. It can be claimed that they all share in the qualities and functions of ownership. This means that the rights (and duties)

<sup>1</sup> It has been argued by some writers, with a good deal of cogency, that legislation should be introduced to eliminate shareholders' rights after a reasonable period. This legislation would restrict the maximum life of industrial shares in public companies to a period of fifty years, after which the shares would revert to those who actually work in the enterprise.

of directors, managers and employees are really all different degrees, aspects and functions of ownership. In an enterprise where there is justice at every level, *all who work do own by participation*, but not all to the same degree, for the degree must be measured by the degree of ultimate responsibility carried.

A further word of explanation may be needed, because this idea of ownership differs from what has hitherto been the commonly accepted view. It must be remembered that we are dealing with comparatively new circumstances. Ownership, until the growth of large concerns, meant either the man who owned his land or his one-man business or the small business man who provided the capital and was also the manager. In each of these cases ownership, in the sense of possession, and function, in the sense of administration, went together. But now we are faced with the situation in a joint stock company where the nominal owners, the possessors, have little or nothing to do with administration, the function of ownership, of what they own jointly as a group.<sup>1</sup> All the shareholders of a big concern could die tomorrow and this would make no difference to the running of the firm. The structure of management would remain untouched. At the same time, so far as the workers are concerned, the old concept of ownership—in the sense of a craftsman owning his tools—could not be made to apply to large-scale production, nor indeed to public utilities either. As we have already seen, it is no way out of the dilemma to say that all productive property should be handed over to the State. That does not help the individual servant of the enterprise, whether manager or worker. A new concept of ownership is needed, where the *function* of administration is more important than the *fact* of possession.

For the most part management in industry today exercises this function, that is behaves as the owner. The manager functions as the owner according to his degree of responsibility—but this responsibility has wider implications than are normally

<sup>1</sup> A shareholder cannot point to any part of a large plant and say "That is mine. I own it." In fact, in English, Canadian and American law shareholders are not recognized as owners of the company in which they hold shares. All the law allows them is a right to share in the residual income of a going concern and to repayment of capital. Cf. George Goyder, *The Future of Private Enterprise*, Oxford 1951, pp. 23-5.

acknowledged. The current idea is that he has a responsibility to the shareholders to produce a dividend, and the bigger the better. But he also has a responsibility to the workers in the enterprise. For the workers have an interest in the enterprise. They have interests and needs which flow from their rights and dignity as human persons, and some of these have to find satisfaction in their work. This does not mean that the ultimate control, the final decision, the direction of the whole enterprise should be taken out of the hands of the general management. But it does mean that this power must always be conditioned by the others who, to the degree of their responsibility, also share in the same kind of ownership as that enjoyed by management. Their relation to the firm is that of a wage contract, and one cannot assert that they have a claim to equal partnership with management and shareholders, although there seems to be no reason why the workers should not have adequate representation on the board of directors, where the ultimate responsibility lies. This would be a recognition of labour's status of partnership in the enterprise. Actually the rights they should claim in virtue of their position in the enterprise and the rights which they would have if they were recognized as legal partners will differ in degree rather than in nature. As one writer has noted, "we have in hard fact already reached this condition in advanced economies, for the distinction between businesses with bonus and pension schemes, paid holidays and sick pay, consultation between management and workmen, etc., and the minimum legal forms of partnership, is already very finely drawn."<sup>1</sup> The value of the recognition of the status of the workers would be that a great step forward would have been taken towards eliminating the ingrained idea of class war. A frank admission of this status, backed up by a sincere effort to make it a reality, would mean the hope of substituting co-operation for conflict in industry.

To sum up, we can distinguish two elements in the idea of ownership: the actual possession of a thing and the function of administering it. In modern industrial conditions it is impossible for ownership, in the sense of the actual possession of the

<sup>1</sup> Edward Holloway in *New Life*, November 1952. This article was one of the first published adumbrations on the analogical idea of ownership.

means of production, to be widespread. Yet it is one of the fundamental principles of Catholic social teaching that ownership must become more widely shared. It is suggested, then, that workers may enjoy the functional benefits of ownership. Through a sound and guaranteed wage structure and bonus system, through security given by pension schemes and protection against victimization, through a fair system of recognition of merits, the workers can have all the economic benefits of ownership. Through industrial democracy that is more than paper plans or fine words they can enjoy (in proportion to their responsibility in the enterprise) the psychological benefits to which they are entitled as co-partners in production.

JOHN FITZSIMONS

---

### ENGLISH IN THE LITURGY<sup>1</sup>

THIS book, edited and introduced by Mr Charles R. A. Cunliffe, contains seven articles which deal in a very interesting way with a subject that is keenly debated at the present time, the use of the vernacular in the Roman rite. These articles were written quite some time ago, and have no direct connexion with the recent international Liturgical Congress at Assisi and Rome, at which the same subject was touched upon by several of the speakers.

The question of the use of English in the Liturgy is a topic which is often discussed with more emotion than reason, and is frequently bedevilled by unwarranted assumptions on both sides, and by the kind of false dichotomy that is common in modern discussions on "hot" questions—the "if you are not a Communist you are a Fascist" type of argument: if you are not a full-blooded "vernaculist" (what a word!), you are a die-hard "traditionalist". In fact, it would appear that there are but few extremists on either side, few who seek for an entirely vernacular Liturgy, few who wish to insist that nothing but Latin must have a place in the public worship of the Church. Most people

<sup>1</sup> *English in the Liturgy—A Symposium*. Pp. 153. (Burns & Oates. 8s. 6d.)

of good sense take a middle view. They are agreeable to the use of much vernacular in the administration of the sacraments and sacramentals, seem somewhat doubtful about the benefit of the vernacular in the Divine Office, and are divided in their views on the extent to which the vernacular—always, be it clearly understood, to a limited extent and under the direction of ecclesiastical authority—should be admitted into the Mass of the Roman rite.

The problem of the vernacular in the Liturgy is entirely a practical one. Those who advocate its use do so mainly because the employment of an unknown tongue is undeniably a barrier to the active participation of Catholics in the Liturgy—the worship of the *entire* Church, not of a part of it, the clergy and the more highly educated, as the Pope stressed in his recent allocution on 22 September—and a stumbling-block to prospective converts, who have been accustomed to worship in their mother tongue.

We are all only too familiar with the distressing sight of a great number of people at Mass, taking no part by voice or gesture in the Liturgy, “silent and detached spectators” (as Pius XI called them), apathetic and bored, because they understand neither the ceremonial nor the language. For a variety of reasons a barrier has, over a long period, arisen between the sanctuary and the nave; the people have no real link with the celebrating ministers, and have little idea of the meaning of corporate worship. While some are present at Mass out of real devotion—realizing the inestimable value of the divine Sacrifice—many, it would seem, are there on Sundays to avoid mortal sin, a very laudable object, no doubt, but very far away indeed from the Church’s desire of active participation in the Sacred Liturgy. It can scarcely be doubted that the exclusive use of Latin—even for those parts of the Mass that of their very nature call for the active participation of the congregation (common prayers, scriptural readings, etc.)—is one of the major causes of this apathy and passivity at Mass.

The articles in *English in the Liturgy* treat this thorny topic in a very sensible way, and from every point of view. They avoid heat and attempt to generate light.

The editor writes the first article on the languages that have

been and are now used in the Roman rite, and gives an up-to-date account of the concessions of the use of the vernacular made so far by the Holy See.

Dr J. McDonald, professor of dogmatic theology at Ushaw College, deals with "Theology and the Language of the Liturgy", to see if there are theological difficulties against the use of the vernacular, and he discusses at length the attitude of the Council of Trent in this matter. His primary conclusion is that "there is no absolute argument for or against the vernacular" (p. 47) on theological grounds.

Next comes "The Liturgical Approach" by Fr Clifford Howell, S.J. His thesis is: "Liturgy is, of its nature, corporate worship. This requires corporate (social) activity for its fully adequate expression: i.e. it implies active external participation by the faithful in different ways. But some of these ways are impossible with an all-Latin liturgy. Therefore, the use of the people's tongue is a necessity, at least in certain parts, if the liturgy is to be an adequate expression of corporate worship" (p. 54). In a brilliant article—ably, closely, cogently argued—he sets forth the case for the use of more English in the Liturgy than is at present allowed in this country. Not content with an excellent positive exposition of the subject, he deals with no less than twenty objections brought against his thesis. In all fairness, those who oppose the greater use of the vernacular in the Liturgy should seriously study Fr Howell's case, and rebut his arguments if they wish to maintain their position.

The case for no change—or a very limited one—in the present position is argued by Fr J. J. Coyne in the article "The Traditional Position", "to voice the fears that he and some others feel about any radical change in our Latin liturgy" (p. 92). He sets forth ably and at length the familiar arguments for the use of Latin; and contends that it is doubtful if any change is desired by any considerable number (he seems to have the Mass and Divine Office chiefly in view), or if the extended use of the vernacular would produce the good effects that are claimed for it. It would seem that Fr Coyne did not see Fr Howell's article, which refutes some of his arguments.

One of the problems concerning the introduction of the vernacular into the Liturgy is the difficulty of obtaining really

satisfactory translations of liturgical texts—a formidable task not fully appreciated by those who have not laboured at the arduous work of translation. This difficulty of obtaining good versions is ably dealt with by Mr H. P. R. Finberg—in an article entitled “The Problem of Style”—who is himself an expert translator of liturgical texts. He is well equipped to handle his subject, for—with sweat and blood and tears—he has for years wrestled with the difficulties of translating the Missal and the Ritual. He sets forth the qualities of the ideal translation, and ends on this optimistic note: “With patience we may evolve . . . a native text that will fall like music on the ear, sentences and paragraphs that we shall murmur to ourselves like the poems we love best, an English liturgy that will delight both heart and mind” (p. 122).

Mr Anthony Milner deals with the difficult subject of “Music in a Vernacular Liturgy” on which he gives wise guidance on a task of “magnitude and delicacy”—the wedding of words and melody. He discusses the attempts being made to use Gregorian chant for vernacular texts. He was not, when he wrote, aware of the recent pronouncement of the Holy Father in his allocution to the congressionists of Assisi, that “when Gregorian chant accompanies the holy sacrifice it must be in the language of the Church”.

The final article, “The Conversion of England”, is by Dom Oswald Sumner. In it he gives his views regarding the impact made on the minds of prospective or actual converts by the present extensive use of Latin in the Church’s services. He explains lucidly the function of all language and answers in the affirmative the question: “Would more English in the liturgy help the layman to enter more deeply and easily into the experience of his religion?” (p. 139), and he begs his readers to rise above emotion when discussing this grave matter. He assesses the value of the vernacular in the making of converts and adds this striking sentence: “If I myself were a Protestant I would feel that the vernacular movement was a most serious and underhand attack on the safety of the Protestant position in England and place the vernacular movement as enemy number one” (p. 144).

The Church has laid down officially two guiding principles

directly regarding the use of the vernacular in the Liturgy: "The use of the Latin language prevailing in a great part of the Church," wrote Pius XII in *Mediator Dei* (1947, §64), "affords at once an imposing sign of unity and an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine. Admittedly the adoption of the vernacular in quite a number of functions may prove of great benefit to the faithful. But to make such concessions is for the Apostolic See alone." And the Church has made these concessions quite generously in recent years by authorizing the use of bilingual rituals in many countries. In his recent allocution to the Assisi congressionists (22 September 1956) the Pope repeated the second principle: "It would be superfluous to call once more to mind that the Church has grave motives for firmly insisting on the absolute obligation in the Latin rite of the celebrating priest to use the Latin language; and similarly, when the holy sacrifice is accompanied by Gregorian chant, it must be in the language of the Church."

Within the framework of these decisions of the Holy See—and a few earlier decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on minor points—this vexed question of the extent to which the vernacular may and should be used in the Liturgy is an open question; reasonable discussion of it should be welcomed and this will be aided and stimulated by the book under review.

In her own good time the Church, aided by the Holy Spirit, will give further due consideration to the arguments on both sides and arrive at wise decisions—that none will question but loyally accept—so that all may actively share, with understanding and joy, in the worship of the Mystical Body.

J. B. O'CONNELL

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### RENUNCIATION OF PROPERTY BEFORE SOLEMN PROFESSION

Before taking solemn vows, a religious must renounce all his property to whomsoever he wishes. Does this include property

which will eventually come to him, but has not yet passed into his possession at the time of his solemn profession? (M. P.)

### REPLY

Canon 581, §1: "Professus a votis simplicibus antea nequit valide, sed intra sexaginta dies ante professionem sollemnem, salvis peculiaribus indultis a Sancta Sede concessis, debet omnibus bonis quae actu habet, cui maluerit, sub conditione securitatis professionis, renunciare."

Canon 582: "Post sollemnem professionem, salvis pariter peculiaribus Apostolicae Sedis indultis, omnia bona quae quovis modo obveniunt regulari: 1<sup>o</sup>. In Ordine capaci possidendi, cedunt Ordini vel provinciae vel domui secundum constitutiones: 2<sup>o</sup>. In Ordine incapaci, acquiruntur Sanctae Sedi in proprietatem."

The common law of the Church imposes on the religious in question the obligation of renunciation, and grants him the right of free disposition, in regard to "all goods which he actually has", the transfer of ownership being conditional upon his subsequent solemn profession and suspended in its effect until then. The answer to the question depends, therefore, on the proper interpretation of the words, "omnia bona quae actu habet".

Possession of property by private individuals, though derived from a natural right, is largely determined by the just prescriptions of the civil law of the country concerned. The common law of England distinguishes between estate "in possession" and "in expectancy". "Where a man is entitled immediately to the possession . . . his estate is said to be in possession; and when entitled to it, not immediately, but at some future time, his estate is said to be in expectancy";<sup>1</sup> and the term "estate" implies "some kind of actual interest or ownership . . . for a *bare possibility* (such, for example, as the expectation of the eldest son of succeeding, upon his father's decease, to the inheritance of his lands), will not satisfy the legal idea of an estate".<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Stephen's Commentaries on the Laws of England*, I, ch. vii, p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. iii, p. 151.

If then, as would appear, we may take "estate in possession" as being roughly the civil equivalent of "omnia bona quae actu habet", it would seem to include all hereditaments, real or personal, corporeal (i.e. tangible) or incorporeal (e.g. rights of value), to which the religious already has, or will before the date of his solemn profession have, an actual as distinct from potential title, valid in law and justice. Thus, to take the example of money, he not only can, but ought ("debet") to dispose, in his renunciation, of all payments which have already fallen due to him, or will before his profession, even though he may only receive them after he has ceased to be capable of ownership. In virtue of his immediate title, he can properly be said actually to possess such monies.

Immediate title to ownership, we think, may reasonably be said to mark the limit of the object of his *obligatory* renunciation and disposition; that is to say, he may leave the disposition of other property which would have accrued to him in the future, but for his solemn profession, to be determined by canon 852. It is morally certain however that immediate title to ownership does not mark the limit of his *right* of free disposition. A ruling of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, 16 September 1885, concedes his right to dispose of goods "quibus ius certum habet" and requires special leave of the Holy See only in respect of those "quae accidentaliter evenire possunt".<sup>1</sup> It instances, as examples of the former, his legal right to inherit a share of his father's or mother's estate. We understand that, under modern English law, children have no legal right to inherit even a part of their parents' estate, except as next of kin in the event of intestacy, though, of course, a religious in England may have a legal right to inherit from an estate governed by the law of another country. Assured rights of this kind have a present money-value, as is clear from the fact that they are acceptable as security for loans, and they can therefore be reasonably counted as present possessions in the wider, yet proper, sense of the words. Hence, unless the constitutions or received practice of his Order provide otherwise,<sup>2</sup> he may,

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.C. Fontes*, n. 2011.

<sup>2</sup> "In Religionibus, in quibus ante Codicis promulgationem ex recepta praxi dispositio de futura haereditate ante sollemnem professionem non admitteretur, hic usus vim suam Codice promulgato retinet."—Schaefer, *De Religiosis*, n. 989.

if he chooses, dispose in his act of renunciation of any future inheritance to which he has a present legal right, even though it be conditional upon an intestacy, and, *a fortiori*, any property which is due to come to him by entail.<sup>1</sup>

The only real point of dispute is whether he can dispose, in advance, of mere expectations such as, for example, a probable though not legally assured legacy or future gift. Some hold that he can, at least when the expectation is well founded, because such expectations also have a present value.<sup>2</sup> Vermeersch<sup>3</sup> and Creusen<sup>4</sup> seem to incline to this view, because they include future property "*especially* if there is a certain right", thereby implying that a certain right is not essential; and Regatillo concedes probability to the opinion.<sup>5</sup> Most authors, however, exclude mere expectations on the ground that, failing a present right, they cannot properly be called *actual* possessions.<sup>6</sup> We think this correct and find difficulty in conceding more than extrinsic probability to the contrary opinion, for it not only strains unduly the proper meaning of the words of canon 581 ("*actu habet*"), but robs those of canon 582 ("*omnia bona quae quovis modo obveniunt regulari*") of all real meaning; the words "*quovis modo*" are made to signify, in practice, "*unexpectedly*". Moreover, as Goyeneche observes, "*hoc pacto religio privatur magna ex parte iure acquirendi per religiosum, quod aequum non est*".<sup>7</sup> The supporters of this opinion are, no doubt, to be commended for their laudable desire to safeguard religious Orders from the danger, or charge, of greed, but they do not need to fall over backwards in order to achieve this end; it is adequately secured by canon 581, understood and applied according to the proper meaning of the words, i.e. as conceding to the religious the right to dispose freely, in the renunciation

<sup>1</sup> Cappello (*Summa Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 615) holds that goods to which he has a certain right not only may, but must, be included in his act of renunciation.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Fanfani, *De Iure Religiosorum*, n. 261; Sipos-Galos, *Enchiridion Iuris Canonici*, §69, 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, I, n. 736.

<sup>4</sup> *Religieux et Religieuses*, n. 249.

<sup>5</sup> *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*, I, n. 724; possibly also Coronata, *Inst.I.C.*, I, n. 593.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Schaefer, op. cit. n. 989; Goyeneche, *Quaestiones Canonicae de Iure Religiosorum*, I, p. 458; Beste, *Introd. in Codicem*, p. 395; Berutti, *Inst.I.C.*, III, n. 96; Jombart, *Traité de Droit Canonique* (ed. Naz), I, n. 869; Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonium*, III, n. 343-4; Cappello, loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup> Loc. cit., footnote 2.

of property which he makes before his solemn profession, of all property to which he has an immediate title, or *certain* future right.

MISTAKE AS TO IDENTITY OF DELEGATE  
FOR MARRIAGE

A parish priest who had prepared a couple for a marriage in his parish was asked by them to let their friend, "Father J. Brown", solemnize it. He agreed and, since he himself was going away, wrote a note delegating "Father J. Brown", which he asked them to give to him. Not till after the wedding did he discover that they had been referring to a newly ordained priest of that name (who in fact performed the wedding), whereas he had assumed that they meant the Father J. Brown who had been a neighbour for several years. Indeed, he had not even adverted to the existence of the other priest. Is the marriage valid? (N.)

REPLY

Canon 1095, §2: "Parochus et loci Ordinarius qui matrimonio possunt valide assistere, possunt quoque alii sacerdoti licentiam dare ut intra fines sui territorii matrimonio valide assistat."

Canon 1096, §1: "Licentia assistendi matrimonio concessa ad normam can. 1095, §2, dari expresse debet sacerdoti determinato ad matrimonium determinatum . . . ; secus irrita est."

We do not know whether the case proposed has actually happened, but that it could easily happen, when a priest with a common surname is designated by a simple initial, is evident from the fact that the *Catholic Directory* for 1955 lists seventeen J. Kellys and twenty-six J. Murphys. Moreover, an almost identical case was recently discussed by Father P. Lumberras, O.P.<sup>1</sup>

It is certain that, for the validity of the delegation, the

<sup>1</sup> Ephemerides Iuris Canonici, 1953, IX, 2, pp. 254 ff.

identity of the delegate must be expressly determined by a direct act of the delegator's own will, not indirectly through the will of a third party.<sup>1</sup> Nor does a *voluntarium interpretativum* suffice, i.e. one which the delegator would have made in certain circumstances, but did not in fact make. Now, it is clear that the parish priest in question did not, by the mere act of inscribing "Father J. Brown" on the note, expressly determine as delegate the newly ordained priest of that name who actually assisted at the marriage, because the name, being equally applicable to both priests, could not of itself adequately determine either. Nor can the ambiguity be settled by appealing to an assumed predominant intention, because this would require a conflict of successive intentions and, in his then state of mind, there was room for only one intention. Admittedly, if he had adverted to the fact that there were two priests of the name mentioned by the parties, he *would*, no doubt, have intended to designate the one they desired; but a *voluntarium interpretativum* of this kind is not a real act of will. In fact, he thought only of the priest with whom he was familiar and his actual intention was consequently limited to that priest. He did not therefore delegate the priest who actually assisted at the marriage.

Father Lumberras, after reaching this conclusion in his discussion of the case, considers the question whether the Church would supply jurisdiction, in virtue of canon 209, to the priest who assisted at the marriage, and decides that she would not. We are inclined to agree with him. The Code Commission, 26 March 1952, has indeed declared that "canon 209 is to be applied to the case of a priest who assists at a marriage without delegation",<sup>2</sup> but there must be a ground for its application, either because of positive and probable doubt, or because of common error, and in the present case there was no question of doubt and very little possibility of common error. Authors are generally agreed nowadays that virtually common error suffices,

<sup>1</sup> Code Commission, 20 May 1923: "Utrum, ad normam canonis 1096, §1, sacerdos sit determinatus, si parochus Superiori monasterii in casu particulari declaret, se ad matrimonium proxima Dominica in ecclesia filiali celebrandum delegare aliquem sacerdotem religiosum, qui a Superiore sequentibus diebus ad Missam die Dominica celebrandum deputabitur. R. Negative."—A.A.S., 1924, XVI, p. 115; Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, I, p. 540.

<sup>2</sup> A.A.S., 1952, XLIV, p. 497.

but the error here would not seem to have been even virtually common. The only circumstance which could have provided a basis for such error, namely, the fact that the newly ordained priest assisted at the marriage as though he were duly delegated to do so, was not naturally apt to mislead the majority of the parishioners, because it was a single act, not to be repeated. Virtually common error can fairly easily arise when a priest behaves as though he were delegated habitually, or for a series of acts, but it can scarcely arise from a single act which has no publicly known fact behind it to give it apparent justification and create a common misconception. The only people likely to be misled in the present case were those who were present at this particular marriage; and that is not common error, either actual or virtual.

This conclusion is supported by a decision of the Sacred Roman Rota in an analogous case. A military chaplain assisted at a marriage, not adverting to the fact that the bridegroom had left the army in the interval between the pre-nuptial investigation (conducted by the chaplain) and the wedding, and had therefore ceased to be subject to his pastoral charge. Since the chaplain no longer had ordinary power to assist at the marriage and had not sought delegation, only the jurisdiction supplied in common error could save the validity of the marriage. The Rota decided that jurisdiction was not supplied, because the error was private and personal to the few people concerned, and therefore that the marriage was invalid.<sup>1</sup> It would seem that it would reach the same decision in the present case.

#### CHURCH WEDDING AFTER CIVIL CEREMONY ABROAD

In France and Germany, couples are at present obliged by law to be married civilly before being married in church. What is the limit of time between, and is a church wedding allowed in this country after a civil ceremony abroad, and *vice versa*? (G. C.)

*Decisiones S.R.R., XXXIV, 1942, dec. 76, coram Pecorari.*

## REPLY

Canon 1016: "Baptizatorum matrimonium regitur iure non solum divino, sed etiam canonico, salva competentia civilis potestatis circa mere civiles eiusdem matrimonii effectus."

The Church is understandably anxious that canonical marriages shall enjoy both the purely civil effects which are within the competence of the State, and also the State's recognition and support of their natural effects; and therefore, where these are not obtainable without civil marriage, she normally requires her subjects to observe the civil form and instructs pastors to question intending couples on this point in the prenuptial enquiry.<sup>1</sup> This precaution does not, of course, imply any sort of positive approval of the civil legislation which, in most modern States, treats marriage as substantially a civil contract and compels Christians, under pain of non-recognition of their union, to go through a form of civil marriage. Whether this form precedes, accompanies or follows the canonical marriage of Christians, it constitutes an unwarranted intrusion into a province which is exclusive to the Church and introduces a confusing dualism into what is intrinsically a single and sacred contract.<sup>2</sup> This confusion is evidently much increased when the civil law, as in France, Germany and Belgium, requires the civil contract to precede the canonical marriage, because this precedence encourages and is probably intended to convey the notion that the religious ceremony is only a pious adornment of a contract already substantially completed. Hence, where, as in England, this precedence of the civil ceremony is not enforced, Catholics are not free to make a preliminary contract before the registrar and would normally sin gravely in doing so, even though they explicitly suspend their real exchange of consent until the canonical marriage.<sup>3</sup>

Our questioner asks what is the limit of time between the civil and the religious ceremony. If he means, how soon after the civil ceremony are the parties canonically bound to marry

<sup>1</sup> S.C.Sacram., *Instruction Sacrosanctum*, alleg. I, n. 14; Mahoney, *Marriage Preliminaries*, n. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. De Smet, *De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio*, n. 457.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mahoney, *Questions and Answers*, I, qu. 341.

in church, the answer is that there is no common law on the point, nor is it easy to see how there could be. In principle, they need never marry in church, because, having as yet contracted no valid bond in the eyes of God, they are not obliged to proceed with the intention implied in the civil formality; and even if they do intend to proceed with it, they are canonically free to postpone its effective execution for as long as they wish, provided they do not meanwhile behave mutually as man and wife. In practice, however, since there is commonly some danger of their living according to their civil status, prudence normally demands that they regularize it by a valid canonical marriage as soon as possible. Hence, when civil marriage was first introduced into Italy, the Sacred Penitentiary, 15 January 1866, issued the following Instruction: "Quod si opportunum est ac expedit ut fideles, sistentes se ad actum civilem peragendum, se probent legitimos coniuges coram lege, hunc tamen actum, antequam matrimonium coram Ecclesia celebraverint, peragere nequaquam debent. Et si qua coactio, aut absoluta necessitas, quae facile admittenda non est, eiusmodi ordinis invertendi causa esset, tunc omni diligentia utendum erit ut matrimonium coram Ecclesia quamprimum contrahatur, atque interim contrahentes seiuncti consistant."<sup>1</sup>

We are not competent to say with authority what the civil law requires in the case of a Catholic wedding here after a civil marriage abroad, but we gather from an instruction issued to the clergy, 6 January 1936, on behalf of the Hierarchy of England and Wales, that all the formalities of English civil law must be observed, "both as to the renewal of consent taking place within a duly registered building, *after notice being given to and a certificate issued by the Superintendent Registrar*, and also in the presence of the Registrar of Marriages."<sup>2</sup> Given therefore that the civil formality has to be repeated in this country, the question of a time-limit, in the civil law, between a civil marriage abroad and its religious convalidation here does not arise.

The practical answer to the second question is that a church wedding will be allowed canonically in this country, after a

<sup>1</sup> Gasparri, *Fontes C.I.C.*, n. 6427, 7°. In Bruges, according to De Smet, *op. cit.*, p. 440 (footnote), the clergy are urged to do their best to have the religious marriage celebrated on the same day as the civil formality.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, July 1946, p. 380.

civil ceremony abroad, provided the local Ordinary is satisfied that there will be no conflict with the civil law. According to an undated appendix in *Decrees of the Leeds Synods*, 1911, "the Bishops of England have agreed that the case of the re-marriage of persons who have gone through the form of marriage in a registry or non-Catholic place of worship be always referred to the Bishop before re-marriage, and his permission be obtained".<sup>1</sup> The primary object of this ruling was admittedly to review the case of those who unwarrantably contract according to the civil law of this country before marrying canonically, but, in view of the danger of conflict between the two *fora*, we consider that it must be equally observed in the case under discussion, and we presume that Ordinaries abroad will likewise insist on being consulted, should the situation be reversed.

L. L. McR.

---

## ROMAN DOCUMENT

### CONCELEBRATION—THE REAL PRESENCE

#### PAPAL ALLOCUTION

EMIS PP. DD. CARDINALIBUS EXCMIS PP. DD. ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPI-  
SCOPIS, CETERISQUE ANTISTITIBUS, SACERDOTIBUS AC RELIGIOSIS,  
QUI CONVENTUI INTERNATIONALI DE LITURGIA PASTORALI, ASSISII  
HABITO, INTERFUERUNT (A.A.S., 1956, XLVIII, p. 711).

. . . *Omissis*.

#### 1. "Actio Christi"

La liturgie de la Messe a comme but d'exprimer sensiblement la grandeur du mystère qui s'y accomplit, et les efforts actuels tendent à y faire participer les fidèles d'une manière aussi active et intelligente que possible. Bien que cet objectif soit justifié, on risque de provoquer une baisse du respect, si l'on détourne l'attention de l'action principale, pour la diriger vers l'éclat d'autres cérémonies.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix xxxvi, p. 102. We understand that this emanated from the Bishops' Meeting, held at Westminster, 15 October 1908.

Quelle est cette action principale du sacrifice eucharistique? Nous en avons parlé explicitement dans l'Allocution du 2 novembre 1954.<sup>1</sup> Nous y citons d'abord l'enseignement du Concile de Trente: "*In divino hoc sacrificio, quod in Missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur et incruente immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel se ipsum cruento obtulit . . . Una enim eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui se ipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa*".<sup>2</sup> Et Nous poursuivions en ces termes: "*Itaque sacerdos celebrans, personam Christi gerens, sacrificat, isque solus, non populus, non clerici, ne sacerdotes quidem, pie religioseque qui sacris operanti inserviunt; quamvis hi omnes in sacrificio activas quasdam partes habere possint et habeant*".<sup>3</sup> Nous soulignons ensuite que, faute de distinguer entre la question de la participation du célébrant aux fruits du sacrifice de la Messe et celle de la nature de l'action qu'il pose, on était arrivé à la conclusion: "*Idem esse unius Missae celebrationem, cui centum sacerdotes religioso cum obsequio adstant atque centum Missas a centum sacerdotibus celebratas*". De cette affirmation, Nous disions: "*Tamquam opinionis error reici debet*". Et Nous ajoutions en guise d'explication: "*Quoad sacrificii Eucharistici oblationem tot sunt actiones Christi Summi Sacerdotis, quot sunt sacerdotes celebrantes, minime vero quot sunt sacerdotes Missam episcopi aut sacri presbyteri celebrantis pie audientes; hi enim, cum sacro intersunt, nequaquam Christi sacrificantis personam sustinent et agunt, sed comparandi sunt christifidelibus laicis, qui sacrificio adsunt*".<sup>4</sup> Au sujet des congrès liturgiques, Nous avons dit en cette même occasion: "*Hi cœtus interdum propriam sequuntur regulam, ita scilicet, ut unus tantum sacrum peragat, alii vero (sive omnes sive plurimi) huic uni sacro intersint in eoque sacram synaxim e manu celebrantis sumant. Quod si hoc ex iusta et rationabili causa fiat, . . . obtinendum non est, dummodo huic modo agendi ne subsit error iam supra a Nobis memoratus*"; c'est-à-dire l'erreur sur l'équivalence entre la célébration de cent Messes par cent prêtres et celle d'une Messe à laquelle cent prêtres assistent pieusement.

D'après ceci l'élément central du sacrifice eucharistique est celui où le Christ intervient comme "*se ipsum offerens*", pour reprendre les termes mêmes du Concile de Trente.<sup>5</sup> Cela se passe à la consécration où, dans l'acte de la transsubstantiation opérée par le Seigneur,<sup>6</sup> le prêtre célébrant est "*personam Christi gerens*". Même si la consécration se déroule sans faste et dans la simplicité, elle est le point central

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, a. 46, 1954, pp. 668-70.

<sup>2</sup> *Conc. Trid.*, Sessio XXII, cap. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, l.c. p. 668.

<sup>4</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, l.c. p. 669.

<sup>5</sup> Sess. XXII, cap. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Cfr. *Conc. Trid.*, Sessio XIII, cap. 4 et 3.

de toute la liturgie du sacrifice, le point central de l' "*actio Christi cuius personam gerit sacerdos celebrans*", ou les "*sacerdotes concelebrantes*" en cas de véritable concélébration.

Des événements récents Nous donnent l'occasion de préciser certains points à ce propos. Quand la consécration du pain et du vin est opérée valablement, toute l'action du Christ lui-même est accomplie. Même si tout ce qui suit ne pouvait être accompli, rien d'essentiel cependant ne manquerait à l'offrande du Seigneur.

Quand la consécration est achevée, l' "*oblatio hostiae super altare positae*" peut être faite et est faite par le prêtre célébrant, par l'Eglise, par les autres prêtres, par chaque fidèle. Mais cette action n'est pas "*actio ipsius Christi per sacerdotem ipsius personam sustinentem et gerentem*". En réalité l'action du prêtre consacrant est celle même du Christ, qui agit par son ministre. Dans le cas d'une concélébration au sens propre du mot, le Christ, au lieu d'agir par un seul ministre, agit par plusieurs. Par contre, dans la concélébration de pure cérémonie, qui pourrait être aussi le fait d'un laïc, il n'y a point de consécration simultanée, et l'on soulève alors une question importante: "Quelle intention et quelle action extérieure sont requises, pour qu'il y ait vraiment concélébration et consécration simultanée?"

Rappelons à ce propos ce que Nous disions dans Notre Constitution Apostolique "*Episcopalis Consecrationis*" du 30 Novembre 1944.<sup>1</sup> Nous y déterminions que dans la consécration épiscopale les deux Evêques, qui accompagnent le Consécrateur, doivent avoir l'intention de consacrer l'Elu, et qu'il doivent par conséquent poser les actions extérieures et prononcer les paroles, par lesquelles le pouvoir et la grâce à transmettre sont signifiés et transmis. Il ne suffit donc pas qu'ils unissent leur volonté avec celle du consécrateur principal et déclarent qu'ils font leurs paroles et ses actions. Ils doivent eux-mêmes poser ces actions et prononcer les paroles essentielles.

Il en va de même dans la concélébration au sens propre. Il ne suffit pas d'avoir et de manifester la volonté de faire siennes les paroles et les actions du célébrant. Les concélébrants doivent eux-mêmes dire sur le pain et le vin: "Ceci est mon Corps", "Ceci est mon Sang"; sinon, leur concélébration est de pure cérémonie.

Aussi n'est-il pas permis d'affirmer que "la seule question décisive en dernière analyse est de savoir dans quelle mesure la participation personnelle, soutenue par la grâce, que l'on prend à cette offrande cultuelle, accroît la participation à la croix et à la grâce du Christ, qui nous unit à Lui et entre nous". Cette manière inexacte de poser la question, Nous l'avons déjà repoussée dans l'Allocution du

<sup>1</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, a. 37, 1945, pp. 131-2.

2 Novembre 1954; mais certains théologiens ne peuvent pas encore y acquiescer. Nous le répétons donc: la question décisive (pour la concélébration, comme pour la Messe d'un prêtre unique) n'est pas de savoir quel fruit l'âme en retire, mais quelle est la nature de l'acte qui est posé: le prêtre, comme ministre du Christ, fait-il ou non l' "*actio Christi se ipsum sacrificantis et offerentis*". De même pour les sacrements, il ne s'agit pas de savoir quel est le fruit produit par eux, mais si les éléments essentiels du signe sacramentel (la position du signe par le ministre lui-même, qui accomplit les gestes et prononce les paroles avec l'intention *saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*) ont été valablement posés. De même dans la célébration et la concélébration, il faut voir si, avec l'intention intérieure nécessaire, le célébrant accomplit l'action extérieure et surtout prononce les paroles, qui constituent l' "*actio Christi se ipsum sacrificantis et offerentis*". Cela ne se vérifie pas, quand le prêtre ne prononce pas sur le pain et le vin les paroles du Seigneur: "Ceci est mon Corps", "Ceci est mon Sang".

## 2. "*Praesentia Christi*"

Tout comme l'autel et le sacrifice dominant le culte liturgique, on doit dire de la vie du Christ, qu'elle est tout entière commandée par le sacrifice de la croix. Les paroles de l'Ange à son père nourricier: "*Salvum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum*",<sup>1</sup> celles de Jean-Baptiste: "*Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi*",<sup>2</sup> celles du Christ lui-même à Nicodème: "*Exaltari oportet Filium hominis, ut omnis qui credit in ipsum, . . . habeat vitam aeternam*",<sup>3</sup> à ses disciples: "*Baptismo . . . habeo baptizari, et quomodo coarctor usquedum perficiatur?*",<sup>4</sup> et celles surtout de la dernière Cène et du Calvaire, tout indique le centre de la pensée et de la vie du Seigneur, c'était la croix et l'offrande de lui-même au Père pour réconcilier les hommes avec Dieu et les sauver.

Mais Celui qui offre le sacrifice, n'est-il pas en quelque sorte plus grand encore que le sacrifice lui-même? Aussi voudrions-Nous à présent vous entretenir du Seigneur lui-même, et d'abord attirer votre attention sur le fait que dans l'Eucharistie l'Eglise possède le Seigneur avec sa chair et son sang, son corps et son âme, et sa divinité. Le Concile de Trente l'a défini solennellement dans la xiii<sup>e</sup> Session can. 1; il suffit d'ailleurs de prendre dans leur sens

<sup>1</sup> Matth. i, 21.

<sup>2</sup> Io. i, 29.

<sup>3</sup> Io. iii, 14-15.

<sup>4</sup> Luc. xii, 50.

littéral, clair et sans équivoque les paroles prononcées par Jésus, pour arriver à la même conclusion: "Prenez et mangez! Ceci est mon Corps, qui va être donné pour vous! Prenez et buvez, ceci est mon Sang, qui va être versé pour vous". Et St Paul dans sa première lettre aux Corinthiens<sup>1</sup> reprend les mêmes termes aussi simples et clairs.

Chez les catholiques, il n'y a, à ce sujet, aucun doute, aucune diversité d'opinion. Mais, dès que la spéculation théologique entreprend de discuter sur la manière dont le Christ est présent dans l'Eucharistie, apparaissent sur nombre de points de sérieuses divergences de vues. Nous ne voulons pas entrer dans ces controverses spéculatives; mais Nous désirerions indiquer certaines limites et insister sur un principe fondamental d'interprétation, dont l'oubli Nous cause quelques préoccupations.

La spéculation doit prendre comme règle que le sens littéral des textes de l'Ecriture, la foi et l'enseignement de l'Eglise ont le pas sur le système scientifique et les considérations théoriques; c'est la science qui doit se conformer à la révélation, et non l'inverse. Quand une conception philosophique déforme le sens naturel d'une vérité révélée, c'est qu'elle n'est pas exacte, ou qu'on ne l'utilise pas correctement. Ce principe trouve son application dans la doctrine de la présence réelle. Certains théologiens, tout en acceptant la doctrine du Concile sur la présence réelle et la transsubstantiation, interprètent les paroles du Christ et celles du Concile de telle sorte, qu'il ne subsiste de la présence du Christ qu'une sorte d'enveloppe vidée de son contenu naturel. A leur avis, le contenu essentiel actuel des espèces du pain et du vin est "le Seigneur au ciel", avec lequel les espèces ont une relation soi-disant réelle et essentielle de contenance et de présence. Cette interprétation spéculative soulève de sérieuses objections, lorsqu'on la présente comme pleinement suffisante, car le sens chrétien du peuple fidèle, l'enseignement catéchétique constant de l'Eglise, les termes du Concile, surtout les paroles du Seigneur exigent que l'Eucharistie contienne le Seigneur lui-même. Les espèces sacramentelles ne sont pas le Seigneur, même si elles ont avec la substance du Christ au ciel une soi-disant relation essentielle de contenance et de présence. Le Seigneur a dit: "Ceci est mon Corps! Ceci est mon Sang!" Il n'a pas dit: "Ceci est une apparence sensible qui signifie la présence de mon Corps et de mon Sang". Sans doute, il pouvait faire que les signes sensibles d'une relation réelle de présence soient des signes sensibles et efficaces de la grâce sacramentelle; mais il s'agit ici du contenu

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xi, 23-5.

essentiel des "*species eucharisticae*", non de leur efficacité sacramentelle. On ne peut donc admettre que la théorie, dont Nous venons de parler, fasse pleinement droit aux paroles du Christ, que la présence du Christ dans l'Eucharistie ne signifie rien de plus et que cela suffise pour pouvoir dire en toute vérité de l'Eucharistie: "*Dominus est*".<sup>1</sup>

Sans doute la masse des fidèles n'est pas en état de comprendre les problèmes spéculatifs difficiles et les essais d'explication concernant la nature de la présence du Christ. Le Catéchisme Romain d'ailleurs invite à ne pas discuter de ces questions devant eux,<sup>2</sup> mais il ne mentionne ni ne propose la théorie esquissée ci-dessus; encore moins affirme-t-il qu'elle épuise le sens des paroles du Christ et les explique pleinement. On peut continuer à chercher des explications et des interprétations scientifiques, mais elles ne doivent pas faire sortir, pour ainsi dire, le Christ de l'Eucharistie et ne laisser dans le tabernacle que des espèces eucharistiques conservant une relation soi-disant réelle et essentielle avec le Seigneur véritable qui est au ciel.

Il est étonnant que ceux, qui ne se contentent pas de la théorie exposée ci-dessus, soient rangés au nombre des adversaires parmi les "physicistes" non-scientifiques, ou que l'on n'hésite pas à déclarer à propos de la conception soi-disant scientifique de la présence du Christ: "Cette vérité n'est pas pour les masses".

A ces considérations, Nous devons ajouter quelques remarques sur le tabernacle. De même que Nous disions tantôt: "le Seigneur est en quelque sorte plus grand que l'autel et le sacrifice", pourrions-Nous dire maintenant: "Le tabernacle, où habite le Seigneur descendu parmi son peuple, est-il supérieur à l'autel et au sacrifice?". L'autel l'emporte sur le tabernacle, parce qu'on y offre le sacrifice du Seigneur. Le tabernacle possède sans doute le "*Sacramentum permanens*"; mais il n'est pas un "*altare permanens*", parce que le Seigneur ne s'offre en sacrifice que sur l'autel pendant la célébration de la sainte Messe, mais non après ni hors de la Messe. Au tabernacle, par contre, il est présente aussi longtemps que durent les espèces consacrées, sans cependant s'offrir en permanence. On a pleinement le droit de distinguer entre l'offrande du sacrifice de la Messe et le "*cultus latreuticus*" offert à l'Homme-Dieu caché dans l'Eucharistie. Une décision de la S. Congrégation des Rites en date du 27 juillet 1927 limite au minimum l'exposition du Saint-Sacrement pendant la Messe;<sup>3</sup> mais elle s'explique aisément par le souci

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. Io. xxi, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cfr. *Catech. Rom.*, pars II, cap. IV, n. 43 sq.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, a. 19, 1927, p. 289.

de maintenir habituellement séparés l'acte du sacrifice et le culte de simple adoration, pour que les fidèles en comprennent clairement le caractère propre.

Toutefois, plus importante que la conscience de cette diversité est celle de l'unité: c'est un seul et même Seigneur, qui est immolé à l'autel et honoré au tabernacle et qui de là répand ses bénédictions. Si on en était bien convaincu, on éviterait maintes difficultés, on se garderait d'exagérer la signification de l'un au détriment de l'autre et de s'opposer aux décisions du Saint-Siège.

Le Concile de Trente a expliqué quelles dispositions d'âme on devait avoir vis-à-vis du Saint Sacrement: "*Si quis dixerit, in sancto Eucharistiae sacramento Christum unigenitum Dei Filium non esse cultu latreutico, etiam externo, adorandum, atque ideo nec festiva peculiari celebritate venerandum, neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem et universalem Ecclesiae sanctae ritum et consuetudinem, sollemniter circumgestandum, vel non publice, ut adoretur, populo proponendum, et eius adoratores esse idololatrias: anathema sit*".<sup>1</sup> "*Si quis dixerit, non licere sacram Eucharistiam in sacrario reservari, sed statim post consecrationem necessario adstantibus distribuendam, aut non licere, ut illa ad infirmos honorifice deferatur: anathema sit*".<sup>2</sup> Qui adhère de cœur à cette doctrine, ne pense pas à formuler des objections contre la présence du tabernacle sur l'autel. Dans l'Instruction du Saint-Office "*De arte sacra*" du 30 Juin 1952,<sup>3</sup> le Saint-Siège insiste, entre autres, sur ce point: "*Districte mandat haec Suprema S. Congregatio ut sancte servantur praescripta canonum 1268, §2 1269, § 1: Ssma Eucharistia custodiatur in praecellentissimo ac nobilissimo ecclesiae loco ac proinde regulariter in altari maiore, nisi aliud venerationi et cultui tanti sacramenti commodius et decentius videatur . . . Ssma Eucharistia servari debet in tabernaculo inamovibili in media parte altaris posito*".<sup>4</sup>

Il ne s'agit pas tant de la présence matérielle du tabernacle sur l'autel, que d'une tendance, sur laquelle Nous voudrions attirer votre attention, celle d'une moindre estime pour la présence et l'action du Christ au tabernacle. On se contente du sacrifice de l'autel, et l'on diminue l'importance de Celui qui l'accomplit. Or la personne du Seigneur doit occuper le centre du culte, car c'est elle qui unifie les relations de l'autel et du tabernacle et leur donne leur sens.

C'est d'abord par le sacrifice de l'autel que le Seigneur se rend présent dans l'Eucharistie et Il n'est au tabernacle que comme "*memoria sacrificii et passionis suae*". Séparer le tabernacle de l'autel,

<sup>1</sup> *Conc. Trid.*, Sessio XIII, can. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Conc. Trid.*, l.c., can. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, a. 44, 1952, pp. 542-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Acta Ap. Sedis*, l.c., p. 544.

c'est séparer deux choses, qui doivent rester unies par leur origine et leur nature. La manière, dont on pourrait placer le tabernacle sur l'autel sans empêcher la célébration face au peuple, peut recevoir diverses solutions, sur lesquelles les spécialistes donneront leur avis. L'essentiel est d'avoir compris que c'est le même Seigneur, qui est présent sur l'autel et au tabernacle.

On pourrait aussi souligner l'attitude de l'Eglise à l'égard de certaines pratiques de piété: les visites au Saint-Sacrement, qu'elle recommande vivement, la prière des quarante heures ou "adoration perpétuelle", l'heure sainte, le transport solennel de la communion aux malades, les processions du Saint-Sacrement. Le liturgiste le plus enthousiaste et le plus convaincu doit pouvoir comprendre et deviner ce que représente le Seigneur au tabernacle pour les fidèles profondément pieux, que ce soient des gens simples ou instruits. Il est leur conseiller, leur consolateur, leur force, leur recours, leur espérance dans la vie comme dans la mort. Non content de laisser venir les fidèles vers le Seigneur au tabernacle, le mouvement liturgique s'efforcera donc de les y attirer toujours davantage.

... *Omissis.*

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A Short History of Philosophy.* By F. J. Thonnard, A.A. Translated by Edward A. Maziarz. 1956. Pp. x + 1074. (Paris, Tournai: Desclée.)

MORE than one thousand pages in handbook format may seem scarcely consistent with the word "short" in the book's title but in point of fact this book is what it purports to be: a general history of Philosophy from the early Greek thinkers to the Neo-Thomism of today. As it stands, it is an English version of the second or third edition of Fr Thonnard's original work.

The first 200 pages deal with Greek thought and if one accepts the dictum of Schiller that every man is naturally either a Platonist or an Aristotelian, then I suspect that Fr Thonnard belongs by temperament to the former category. His pages on Plato are very good. Although he feels it needful to reprimand the founder of the Academy for his neglect of the study of the material world, he is fascinated by Plato's breadth of mind and all-embracing thought. Aristotle may have "a knowledge of universal range, more

human and more reliable" but Fr Thonnard finds him "less inspiring". I welcome nearly thirty pages on Plotinus who is often relegated to a brief paragraph or two in histories of philosophy. And Fr Thonnard quite properly absolves Plotinus from the charge of pantheism with which more than once he has been saddled in scholastic text books.

As an Augustinian, the author comes into his own in treating of St Augustine to whom he devotes exactly the same number of pages as to St Thomas, with this difference, that half of the space allotted to Aquinas is concerned with the historical situation of the mid-thirteenth century. This Christian section occupies one-quarter of the volume.

Modern thought is studied for 500 further pages. Fr Thonnard has his own preferences and standards of relative importance. That is inevitable. He is very fair to English thought, leaving adequate room for Hobbes and the freethinkers, for Locke, Berkeley and Hume. Spinoza and Leibniz receive more summary handling and generally less attention is paid to German philosophy than to French. There is a detailed analysis of Kant but Hegel is soon dismissed, while Fichte and Schelling are rationed to one page apiece.

In the nineteenth century England again is prominent with long appreciations of Spencer and especially Mill. French Positivism is examined with predilection, in the systems of Comte and Taine, the sociological theories of Durkheim, the idealism of Boutroux and Hamelin and the *critique de la science* of Renouvier and Poincaré. This second half of the work concludes with a warm study of Henri Bergson plus some notes on the development of Neo-Thomism. Once again, German thought is less fully and perhaps not adequately dealt with. There is bare mention of the Neo-Kantians or the Neo-Hegelians of the Italian tradition, though I would consider these more significant philosophically than Taine. But these are minor details and, to some extent, matters of personal taste and judgement. The book provides a solid and useful compendium which students in particular will find valuable. One admirable feature is the series of biographies attached to individual thinkers and schools of thought, together with a number of indexes at the end.

*Katholische Dogmatik*. Vol. V.: *Mariologie*. By Michael Schmaus. Pp. 416. (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1956. D.M. 17 (paper), 19.80 (linen).)

IN introducing this fifth volume of his Dogmatic Theology in the German vernacular Prälat Schmaus remarks that it is no easy task these days to compose a theological work on our Lady. There is, to

begin with, a certain danger of exaggeration: devotion may run away with argument. For the cautious theologian there is the opposite risk of understatement with the consequence that full justice may not be done to our Lady's unique position and dignity. Dr Schmaus has succeeded very happily in steering a proper middle course. He has also in mind a non-Catholic audience, for during the past twenty years much theological discussion has been carried on by Catholics and Protestants in Germany with fruitful results. It is fair to say, I think, that Catholic theology has exercised a certain influence on German Protestant thought.

This volume begins with a study of tradition and the development of doctrine—important matters when we are dealing with the theology of Mary. The views of Franzelin, Scheeben, Newman and the Tübingen school are examined as are more recent suggestions by Fr Koster, O.P., and Fr Karl Rahner, S.J.

The treatment follows traditional lines, with reference in the following order to documents of the Church and Papal encyclicals, scripture, tradition and theological argument. But the matter is presented in flowing narrative, not after the pattern of a school manual. The book is excellently produced and pleasant to handle. My one misgiving is whether the paper cover is sufficiently strong.

The four dogmas on which the theology of our Lady rests are: the Motherhood of God, the Virginity, the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. The first two were made explicit in the early Christian centuries. The "Motherhood" of course lies at the centre of them all. It was because of that unique relationship in which she stood to Jesus Christ that she was freed from the natural human heritage of original sin and her soul enriched and embellished with grace. Dr Schmaus traces the history of the fourth- and fifth-century heresies and the definitions of Ephesus and Chalcedon. He notes that the Protestant Reformers did not deny this "Motherhood"; that they could scarcely do and retain the name of Christians. But they certainly neglected this doctrine and pushed it into the remote background. He draws considerably upon modern German authors, e.g. on *Maria im Neuen Testament* by K. H. Schelke (1953), *Die Mutter des Herrn* of Romano Guardini (1954), and *Maria im Erdenleben* by Fr Paul Gaechter, S.J. (1952). He illustrates copiously from the Fathers and this is both a pleasing feature and a strong point in the book.

Virginity, Immaculate Conception and Assumption are dealt with in sequence and the intimate connexion of these three doctrines is carefully traced. The Virginity is clearly evidenced from tradition, even in the first centuries. Dr Schmaus discusses the

problem of tradition for the Assumption. He points to one scriptural argument, used directly to prove the Immaculate Conception, but which has its application less directly to the Assumption. The promise in the Protoevangelium is given to the woman as well as to her seed, that is to say, to Mary as well as Christ. The promise involves a full triumph over the "serpent" and Christ achieved this victory in His Resurrection and Ascension. Therefore, by analogy, Mary also should be "assumed".

Dr Schmaus uses, though he also criticizes, Faller's work on the Assumption, *De priorum saeculorum silentio circa Assumptionem Beatae Mariae Virginis*, published in 1946. Faller professes to discover a tradition that goes back to the late fourth century. But Timothy of Jerusalem whom Faller cites as his first witness and dates c. A.D. 400 is placed much later by Dr Schmaus and in the second half of the sixth century by other authorities. Two passages are also quoted from Epiphanius, *Haereses*, lxxviii, 11 and 24. But on examination it is doubtful whether these passages can be invoked to prove any tradition of Assumption. For Timothy of Jerusalem merely says that our Lady did not die, and Epiphanius that the New Testament does not inform us whether she died or not, and was buried or not. Epiphanius goes on to declare that he will not himself venture to say whether our Lady still lives or has died: it is all shrouded in mystery. In section 24 he presents his readers with the two alternatives: either our Lady is dead and buried or she is still living in some remote and hidden place on earth.

The earliest explicit mention of the Assumption is found in the fifth-century *Transitus Mariae*, unfortunately an apocryphal work and mentioned as such in the Decretum Gelasianum and, what is more, condemned in the Decretum Gratiani. However, Dr Schmaus argues that, though an apocryphal book needs careful handling, it may provide real evidence of the existence of a tradition. He is inclined to dismiss a reference in Gregory of Tours as not of much value on the grounds that it derives from apocryphal sources and he finds the first stable witnesses in seventh- and eight-century figures, like Modestus of Jerusalem, Andrew of Crete, the Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople and St. John Damascene. There are two interesting extracts from liturgies of the same period:

"Fusis precibus Dominum imploremus ut ejus indulgentia illuc defuncti liberentur a tartaro, quo beatae Virginis translatum corpus est de sepulcro. Quae nec de corruptione susceptit contagium, nec resolutionem pertulit in sepulcro, pollutione libera, assumptione secunda . . . Parum fortasse fuerat, si te

Christus solo sanctificasset introitu, nisi etiam talem matrem adornasset egressu. Recte ab ipso suscepta est in assumptione feliciter, quem pie susceptisti conceptura per fidem, ut quae terrae non eras conscia, non teneret rupes inclusa" (Gothic Missal, seventh century).

"Veneranda nobis domine hujus est diei festivitas, in qua sancta Dei genetrix mortem subiit temporalem, nec tamen mortis nexibus deprimi potest" (Gelasian Sacramentary, eighth century).

The second half of the volume deals with our Lady's relation to the Church and her part in Redemption and Mediation. Here the author discourses at considerable length on the Redemption itself and the nature and claims of the Church of Christ. Before dealing with the Marian question, he is preparing the ground through argument with his non-Catholic readers. Her relation is twofold: at the beginning, as it were, for she is the Second Eve as Christ is the Second Adam. Dr Schmaus notes that the New Testament speaks of the Church and not our Lady as the Second Eve but that title is applied to her throughout tradition; and it fits harmoniously into the Pauline scheme of thought. But our Lady is also, as St Ambrose declares, the "type" of the Church, in Dr Schmaus's expressions, its *Inbild* and *Inbegriff*.

Large use of Papal encyclicals is made in the treatment of the two final themes: Mary's part in the Redemption and her position of Mediator. Passages are reproduced from *Octobri mense*, *Magnae Dei Matris* and *Adjutricem populi* of Leo XIII, *Ad illum diem laetissimum* of Pius X, *Lux Veritatis* of Pius XI, and *Mystici Christi Corporis* of the present Holy Father. Dr Schmaus rejects the theories of the Dutch theologian Dr W. Goossens as negative and insufficient and he is inclined to associate himself with Köster and Dillenschneider, in the latter's *Le Mystère de la corrédemption mariale* (1955). This book argues that the new "testament" given to mankind by Christ through His sacrifice and death needed positive acceptance on the part of mankind. It was our Lady, according to this interpretation, who accepted that sacrifice and testament positively on behalf of the human family. Our acceptance was included virtually in her acceptance; it is made actual through grace and the sacraments. Finally, as regards mediation, he explains but falls short of accepting the theory of a quasi-sacramental "mediation" on our Lady's part which was put forward by the late Anselm Stolz, O.S.B.

This is a solid, comprehensive and scholarly work, which at one and the same time can be read with pleasure as well as studied. It is also a tribute of sincere devotion to Mary.

J. M.

*Our Faith.* By His Lordship the Bishop of Leeds. Pp. 286. (Nelson. 12s. 6d., or 10s. to Schools.)

THOSE who would prefer to feel optimistic and positive, rather than merely despondent, about the Secondary-modern school and its religion, will be much encouraged by the appearance of Bishop Heenan's new book. It is a volume of generous proportions, not like most school books, and its white binding and artistic wrapper provide further attractions. Its chief destined reader is the fourteen-year-old in his last year at school, and he is expected to take the book with him when he leaves, so that he and the rest of the family may refresh their minds at its fountains for years afterwards. Even if he is allergic to anything in book form, the school-leaver will hardly resist studying the numerous pictures, which are partly the well-known Nelson pictures from Scripture (notably well chosen) and partly modern photographs showing close-ups of the sacraments and such like. Even better are the bishop's illustrations and comparisons in the text, often exceedingly apt and useful even to priest-readers. Another good point is several chapters of Church history, especially in England; this should be quite a thrill for those pupils for whom past history has some meaning. As for the book's theological approach, this runs on the well-established Roman lines of our youthful days, but strongly flavoured with the mind of the Missionary Society of which the bishop was formerly such a distinguished member; that is to say, a bias towards the apologetical aspect of things, and an overwhelming stress on the infallibility of the Church. "*Remember the Church has an answer to every problem you will face during your life, and the answer the Church gives is always correct*" (page 282. One is tempted to ask whether such a proposition is intended as a defensible theological thesis, or as just a rough-and-ready pep-talk for the unlearned faithful? And if the latter, would it necessarily have the intended effect in the long run even on the more thoughtful of the Secondary-moderns?). In his short stabbing Roman-gladius-like sentences the author gives clear-cut explanations of the Church's teaching, especially of things that lend themselves to explanation. But "*the Blessed Trinity is a mystery. It is a waste of time to explain a mystery,*" so this doctrine is dealt with in a few lines on page 48 (plus, of course, the usual Personal identifications at points such as Incarnation or Confirmation). The Second Coming too, a doctrine which loomed so large in the early centuries and has had such a dramatic come-back in the liturgical movement, is another item that does not lend itself to matter-of-fact explaining; if there is any mention of it in the book (other than a citation of 1 Peter i, 7, in a different connexion) the present reviewer has not discovered it.

However, it might seem churlish to make any complaints about a harvest so rich. Only time and use can show whether the bishop's mingling of admirably clear explanation and fatherly exhortation will ring a bell in the mind of that enigmatic figure, the fourteen-year-old from the non-practising home. Will he (or some of him) say to himself "Well, I never realized all this before—I must go to Mass next Sunday, and make So-and-so come with me too"? Or will he say "Exactly—all this is just what I want to have done with"? All of us are thinking and experimenting, and here is a valuable contribution from one of the successors of the apostles. May it prove to be a kind of sacrament, abundantly carrying the Grace of God.

F. M.

*Black Gown and Redskins. Adventures and Travels of the Early Jesuit Missionaries in North America (1610-1791). Selected and Edited by Edna Kenton. (Longmans. 25s.)*

At the turn of the century there was issued serially between 1896 and 1901 a complete edition of the "Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents" in seventy-three volumes, with a long Historical Introduction by R. G. Thwaites, some portraits, and a very full index. From this encyclopaedic work the late Edna Kenton compiled what is described as a careful and representative selection, first published in Great Britain in 1926. Miss Kenton's one-volume edition is now republished with Thwaites' Introduction, her own Foreword, and a new explanatory Preface by Professor David B. Quinn, but without the portraits. A map, as frontispiece, shows the vast area involved, the whole of the St Lawrence basin and the lands surrounding the Great Lakes; but it would have been well to have here portraits (which are mentioned in the index) of the martyrs, Brébeuf and Lalemant, of the famous Peré Marquette, and of "the St Genevieve of New France", the Iroquois girl, Catherine Tegakouita. On the other hand, we have Thwaites' useful biographical notes, for many readers who may know about Frontenac or Bishop Laval de Montmorency may be without much information about the Jesuit missionaries and martyrs.

The compression of so many lengthy narratives into a single volume of some five hundred pages has been very skilfully performed, and a coherent and readable story is presented, the range and extent of which can be judged by a very brief summary. First, the beginnings, 1611-34. Then the development of the Huron Mission, 1635-42. Part III gives ten pieces about the "Huron Martyrs" and the Iroquois warfare, and this covers the sufferings of St Isaac Jogues and the martyrdom of Antoine Daniel, of Jean de Brébeuf and his

companion Gabriel Lalemant. Part IV relates the expansion westward of New France from the middle of the seventeenth century to the terminal date of the work of the French Jesuits 1763, and particularly the labours of Fr Marquette. Lastly, there are three pieces dated 1763 relative to the consequences of the Suppression of the Society in France.

"Black Gown" was the Indian appellation for the Jesuit missionaries who sent these *Relations* for the information of their superiors. Even in the present condensed form they provide a wealth of information about the Indian tribal groupings, their customs and behaviour and their reactions to the activity of the missionaries. The ethnological and anthropological information is valuable, although the priestly character of the writers naturally limited the scope of their researches. As a narrative of exploration and discovery, as well as of suffering and sacrifice, nothing could be more impressive. Merely to live and work quietly among savages in such a country—*locus horrois et vastae solitudinis*, as it was aptly called by *Peré Paul Raguénau* writing in 1649 to the General in Rome—was heroic; but martyrdom, and that by ghastly torture, was always a present possibility and in some cases was their actual fate. What those intrepid and devoted men must have endured in such conditions is something beyond our imagination; but it is all related calmly and objectively, without emphasis or eloquence.

J. J. DWYER

*The Curé d'Ars.* By Abbé Trochu. Translated by Ronald Matthews. Pp. vi + 193. (Burns Oates. 12s. 6d.)

ONE notices in the rooms of the clergy an increasing number of statuettes representing St John Vianney, a kneeling figure in surplice and stole, with hands joined and eyes raised to heaven in prayer. This is a wholesome sign of the times; it means that the parochial clergy have taken to their hearts the special patron named for them by Pope Pius XI. Several biographies of the saintly curé have appeared, but this new work by the Abbé Trochu, an abridged edition of his full-length study, is the most popularly readable yet published.

John Vianney was a poor boy of limited intellectual abilities, but with a burning vocation for the service of the Lord. Like most of the saints he had a quite wonderful mother, whom he accompanied to daily Mass from his fifth birthday. She gave him much needed encouragement in his studies, helping him to overcome difficulties apparently insurmountable. After years of patient application he still fell far short of required standards, but his bishop—

with wisdom from heaven—said: "We've absolutely got to keep a man like this in the diocese." John Vianney was ordained, and he became the greatest priest the diocese ever possessed. His apostolate was not, so to say, waiting for him; he had to make it, and at the expense of positive slavery in the service of the Master. Ars was the worst of a hundred wretched parishes with scarcely a spark of religion. In time it became a model for the whole world, through the unremitting labours of its saintly pastor who became the heavenly patron of the world's pastoral clergy.

The work of the confessional is one of the most trying parts of a priest's life; and it is the part in which St John Vianney excelled. He was the most merciful of men, but he could—and sometimes did—refuse absolution. The people of Ars were notorious for drink, the non-observance of Sunday and general godlessness, due mainly to a lack of instruction. Their parish priest, therefore, instructed them, but he looked to them to turn his instructions into practical Catholicity, which took time—years and years of time. His final triumph over evil was commensurate with his zeal: it was phenomenal. His edifying life-story is one of great encouragement; and perhaps there is nothing the clergy need more than encouragement in their uphill work for souls. Here is a book that will most certainly give them heart to continue their labours for God.

L. T. H.

*Mabel Digby.* By M. K. Richardson. Pp. x + 270. (Longmans, Green. 16s. 6d.)

FEW among the eminent Catholic women of the nineteenth century exercised so widespread an influence as did Mabel Digby, who is here presented in a series of portraits from her earliest years until her last; as child, adolescent, young woman, religious, and finally Superior General of the Sacred Heart nuns. The book is by no means a formal biography. It is factual and historical, but such details as dates do not obtrude sufficiently to hold up the narrative. In order to retain the interest of her readers—the younger in particular—the author has turned the "Life" of her subject into a fast-moving story, with an abundance of the sort of dialogue that prevents the reader's interest from flagging and compels attention throughout.

When, long after marriage, Mabel Digby's mother was received into the Church, the daughter, like the husband, was shocked and hurt, and she vowed that never would she cross the threshold of a Catholic church. St John Vianney thought otherwise on being told about her; and when once this strong-minded, intelligent, warm-hearted girl found herself before the Tabernacle, she knew she was

conquered. No more thorough conversion ever took place. Henceforth her life was completely dedicated as a fervent religious to the education of girls; and this at a time when the Faith in England depended so very much upon the religion of its Catholic women.

The nineteenth century provided a powerful setting for the career of Mabel Digby. It was a time of eminent churchmen, great statesmen, famous authors and poets, distinguished artists and musicians. Their names and achievements were familiar at every dinner-table, including the Digbys', making the call of the world a fascinating reality to so attractive and gifted a girl as Mabel. It was the fact of her turning her back upon social success that gave her the prominent position she holds in the history of Victorian England. Her wide influence remains, whilst that of her seemingly greater contemporaries has largely disappeared: they exemplified the transient nature of earthly renown, whereas her name is surrounded with no passing glory.

L. T. H.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### SEX PROBLEMS—PSYCHIATRISTS AND MORALISTS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, November 1956, pp. 678-842)

The Rev. Ivor Daniel writes:

Baron von Gagern is a psychiatrist and the Abbé Oraison is a priest-psychiatrist. Both of them hear confessions and give counsel, but only one can give Absolution.

Knowing as I do the immense importance of the priestly work which the latter accomplishes, and the becoming humility with which he received the condemnation of a book which, in spite of the expressions criticized, had been of great help to struggling souls, I hope that L. L. McR.'s knowledge of (the Abbé) Oraison's teaching as a whole may, with permission, or by the publication of a revised edition, become first hand. Meanwhile we may all read *L'Union des Epoux*—a masterly outlining of the normal sexual ideal recently published with "Nihil obstat" and "Imprimatur" in the *Bibliothèque Ecclesia*. The valiant author "presents this work to the public largely as an attempt to dissipate the doubt caused by a preceding book which became the object of a measure of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office. In this previous work, in fact, he

had not sufficiently taken in consideration the traditional doctrine in use, in the Latin Church, with regard to human acts. Certain readers could have drawn from it—falsely—a conclusion according to which one could not commit formal sin except by malice and not by weakness. This conclusion is contrary to the thought of the author, and if he can have contributed to this interpretation—erroneous and contrary to traditional teaching—he begs excuse for it. He hopes that the present work will appease the inquietudes which his previous book may have aroused”.

These are honest and humble words—the words of a true priest and a great physician. As a missionary, chaplain, and parish priest with a lifetime of spiritual direction behind me, I would like to say that the Abbé's first work—which I read long before its condemnation—helped me more than anything I have ever read on the subject. I hope that the ambiguous passages may be revised, and that the sound core of information may be approved by authority and reissued.

The truth, as usual, lies between two stools. The Baron, sitting on his, appreciates the verdict of the other one while the Abbé, occupying both with honour puts them together as a humble throne in the Paris garret to which so many climb breathlessly to consult him. To many a harassed soul he imparts the wisdom of moral theology and psychiatry with the absolving words of the Great Healer whom he serves so well.

#### FILM STRIPS IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, December 1955, p. 714)

The Rev. G. C. Davey writes:

In December 1955 THE CLERGY REVIEW published a most useful and helpful article on “Film Strips in Religious Education” by the Rev. Aidan Pickering: an article for which I had been waiting for twenty-five years.

I only write now to amplify Fr Pickering's instructions on how to get material from the Salesians at Turin.

I have tried almost all the religious film strips on the market, and would say without hesitation that the Salesian series is, on the whole, the most comprehensive, the cheapest, and of the greatest educational value of any. A strip of between 40 and 50 frames costs 350 lire (about 2s.) in black and white or 900 lire (under 10s.) in colour. Strips of half the length in England (apart from St Paul Films,

which are very good value, and also Italian) cost 12s. in black and white, and 25s. in colour.

The problem is, however, to get the money across. I carried out the complicated procedure advocated by Fr Pickering, and the Salesians were very good and sent not only the invoice but the films by return. I never checked my bank statement to discover whether the money actually reached them!

Today, however, in quite another connexion, I had occasion to send some money to France, and discovered that International money orders up to the value of £10 in any one day can be sent with very little formality. A simple application form is obtainable from any post office, and the permit is sent by return. The procedure may also be used for books, periodicals, etc. This seems a much simpler solution of the difficulty.

Readers may be interested in the result of a year's experience teaching Catechism with the aid of film strips. It may be summed up in one sentence culled from the Salesian catalogue "One picture is worth a thousand words"—"Un'immagine vale mille parole".

My problem is to cram a modicum of Christian faith and morals into an age group of 5-14 years in a bare thirty minutes a week. This is a tiny parish with no Catholic School, and no possibility of ever having one. Children come at the age of five often not knowing even how to make the sign of the Cross.

Thanks to the Film Strip Projector, I can now get as much into a week as formerly into a term. Better still, it sticks. After a year's work, even the youngest understands what the Mass is about, can describe each mystery of the Rosary, has a knowledge of the Creation and the Redemption, knows the life of the four Patron Saints of the British Isles as well as the lives of St Alban, St Edward the Confessor and St Cuthbert, can recognize the Holy Shroud and say something about it, besides, needless to say, knowing the Commandments, the Sacraments, the Creed, and the life of our Blessed Lord. For the first time I can keep up with the "Syllabus of Religious Instruction for Schools".

The greatest joy, however, is to see the children hurrying to get to Catechism on time and their disappointment when the session is over; a thing I never imagined could be possible.

#### PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

and  
d out  
the  
t the  
over

on to  
ional  
with  
from  
may  
npler

ience  
named  
ecture  
e".

morals  
week.  
ity of  
owing

n into  
year's  
t, can  
cation  
of the  
fessor  
ething  
s, the  
or the  
uction

to get  
ion is

hed for  
W.I., in